



FAIRFAX COUNTY PARK AUTHORITY

M E M O R A N D U M



TO: Chairman and Members
Park Authority Board

VIA: Michael A. Kane, Director

FROM: Cindy Messinger, Director
Resource Management Division

DATE: March 15, 2006

Agenda

Resource Management Committee
Wednesday, March 22, 2006 – 6:30 p.m.
Board Room – Herrity Building
Chairman: Frank S. Vajda

1. Adoption of the 2006-2010 Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan – Action*
2. Contract Award – Open End Contract for Archaeological Services – Action*
3. Contract Award – Open End Contract for Cultural Landscape Report Consultant Services – Action*
4. Approval – Installation of a Plaque at Mt. Zephyr Park – Action*

*Enclosures

cc: Timothy K. White
Leadership Team

Board Agenda Item
April 26, 2006

ACTION -

Adoption of the 2006-2010 Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan

ISSUE:

The purpose of the Cultural Resource Management Plan is to coordinate agency-wide action to achieve the Park Authority Board's resource preservation vision as articulated in adopted policies, the 1995-2010 Park Comprehensive Plan, and the 2002-2006 Park Authority Strategic Plan. Staff has completed a public comment process for the draft plan and has made a number of changes to the document as a result of public input. The revised plan is now presented for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Park Authority Director recommends approval of the draft 2006-2010 Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan.

TIMING:

Board action is requested on April 26, 2006 to allow the plan to proceed.

BACKGROUND:

As required by the Fairfax County Park Authority 2002-2006 Strategic Plan, staff has created a draft Cultural Resource Management Plan for the agency. The plan covers a five-year time period from FY 2006-2010. The plan format is the same as the agency Natural Resource Management Plan, adopted by the Park Authority Board in January 2004.

On December 14, 2005, the Park Board authorized staff to release the draft 2006-2010 Cultural Resource Management Plan for public comment. The document was released on December 19, 2005 and staff began extensive outreach to the community to solicit comments. Among those notified were local jurisdictions, government agencies, peer organizations, community groups, partner organizations, volunteers and individuals. A list of outreach targets is provided as Attachment 1.

During the forty-five day comment period a total of 241 comments were received from 22 organizations and individuals. The comments are summarized in Attachment 2, which provides page references to the revised plan.

Board Agenda Item
April 26, 2006

A staff project team has reviewed and evaluated each comment received from the public and has incorporated many of the suggested changes into to the final draft plan, which is presented as Attachment 3 for the Board's consideration.

Following the Board's adoption of the 2006-2010 Cultural Resource Management Plan, staff will prepare an implementation plan for 2006 to select which elements of the plan will be addressed in the first year of the five-year plan.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Many elements of the plan can proceed with current fiscal and personnel resources. As noted in the plan, some strategies will require additional funding , which the Park Authority will seek through all available means. To the extent that strategies in the plan add tasks in the master planning process, some additional cost and/or duration may be seen in projects. Other potential costs will be options for Board consideration at the time design or construction projects are approved, or when the Board considers policy changes.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Attachment 1: Cultural Resource Management Plan Distribution List

Attachment 2: Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan,
Public Comment Summary

Attachment 3: Draft Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan
2006 – 2010 dated April 26, 2006

STAFF:

Michael A. Kane, Director

Timothy K. White, Chief Operating Officer

Cindy Messinger, Director, Resource Management Division

Charlie Bittenbring, Director, Park Services Division

Lynn Tadlock, Director, Planning and Development Division

Todd Johnson, Director, Park Operations Division

Miriam Morrison, Director, Administration Division

Michael Rierson, Manager, Resource Stewardship Branch

Cindy Walsh, Manager, Site Operations Branch

Liz Crowell, Project Manager, Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section

Cultural Resource Management Plan Distribution List

Organization	Contact	Delivered Via	Contact Date	By Whom	Note
Fairfax County					
Fairfax County Park Authority Board	12	In person	12/14/05	Liz Crowell	
Fairfax County History Commission	20	In person	1/4/06	Liz Crowell	
Fairfax County Architectural Review Board	10	In person	1/12/06	Liz Crowell	
Federal Agencies					
National Park Service National Capital Region (NCR) Historic Landscapes Initiative (HLI) National Register (NRHP) NAGPRA Great Falls (GF) Historic Landmarks (HL)	Dr. Stephen Potter (NCR) Marian Creveling (NCR) Robert Sonderman (NCR) Dr. Gary Scott (NCR) Charles Birnbaum (HLI) Lucy Lawliss (HLI) Carol Shull (NRHP) Dr. Sherry Hutt (NAGPRA) Dr. Barbara Little Susan Henry Renaud Dr. Dick Waldbauer Dr. Jesse Reynolds (GF) Dr. John Sprinkle (HL) Jenny Masur Kimberly Benson Jack Boucher Brenda Barrett	Hard copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	John Fowler Don Klima Dr. Ron Anzalone Dr. Tom McColloch Dr. Laura Henley Dean Martha Catlin Druscilla Null Patricia Knoll	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Bureau of Land Management	Troy Ferone	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Smithsonian Institution Physical Anthropology (PA) Anthropology Processing Lab (AP)	Dr. Douglas Owsley (PA) Deborah Hull-Walski (AP) Dr. James Krakker (AP)	Hard Copy and Electronic	12/19/05		
US Forest Service	Dr. Michael Barber George Tolley	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
NAVFAC EFE South (the Navy)	Len Winter	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Department of Veterans Affairs	Patricia (Tish) Tyson			Liz Crowell	
Department of the Army	Dr. Leo Hirrel Dr. Tim Thompson Brian Lione	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Library of Congress	Karen A. Stuart Diane Schug-O'Neill	Electronic	1/6/05	Liz Crowell	
National Archives	Jerry Luchansky	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
MWAA	Henry Ward	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Architect of the Capitol	William Allen	Electronic	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	
Virginia State and County Agencies					
Virginia Department of Historic Resources	Dr. Ethel Eaton David Hazzard Keith Egloff	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	

Virginia Department of Rail and Transportation	Karl Rohrer	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Alexandria Archaeology	Dr. Pamela Cressey Dr. Steven Shephard Barbara Magid Francine Bromberg	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Arlington County	Cynthia Liccese Torres Dr. Constance Werner Ramirez	Hard Copy and Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Fairfax City Historic Resources	Dr. Chris Martin Susan Gray	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Prince William County	Justin Patton	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
VDOT	Mary Ellen Norrissey Hodges Tony Opperman Helen Ross J. Mark Wittkofski	Electronic	1/05/06	Liz Crowell	
Historic Alexandria	Jean Taylor Federico	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Fort Ward	Wally Owen	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Other State, County and City Agencies					
DC Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	Lisa Burcham Nancy Kassner Steve Callcott Tim Denee David Maloney	Hard Copy and Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Maryland Historical Trust (SHPO)	Beth Cole Richard Hughes Marcia Miller	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Maryland DHCD	Dennis Curry	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Jefferson Patterson Park (MD)	Wayne Clark Dr. Julia King	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Maryland State Highway Administration	Dr. Carol Ebright	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
MNCPPC Montgomery County, MD	Dr. Jim Sorenson	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
St. Mary's City Commission	Dr. Henry Miller	Electronic	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	

	Dr. Tim Riordan Silas Hurry				
MNCPPC Prince Georges County, MD	Donald Creveling	Hard Copy And electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Delaware SHPO	Faye Stocum Alice Guerrant Craig Lukezic	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
	Charles Fithian		1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Delaware Department of Transportation	Kevin Cunningham	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Delaware Natural Resources and Environmental Control	Dr. Cara Blume	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
City of Wilmington	Debbie Martin	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Bureau of Historic Preservation (PA) (SHPO)	Dr. Kurt Carr	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
PennDOT	Dr. Ira Beckerman	Electronically	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Arkansas Archaeological Survey	Dr. Leslie Stewart-Abernathy	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
New Jersey DOT	David Mudge	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Private Organizations					
Chantilly Battlefield Association	Ed Wenzel	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Northern Virginia Chapter of the Archaeological Society of Virginia	All paid members	Electronically and in person	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	
National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers	Nancy Schamu	Electronic	1/11/05	Liz Crowell	
Preservation Roundtable	Philip Brooks Ward Bucher Alexandra Glanz-Berger C.I. Cassell James Goode Amy Hecker Christine Henry Penny Jones	Electronic	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	

	Bob Kapsch Russell Keune Dorn McGrath Nancy Metzger Harry Schwartz Rex Scouten Clift Seferlis Paula Mohr Susan West Montgomery Terry Morton M Hamilton Morton Cherilyn Widell Patricia Williams Evelyn Mittman Wrin				
SRI Foundation	Dr. Terry Klein	Electronic		Liz Crowell	
National Trust for Historic Preservation	George Siekkinen Peter Brink Kathy Adams	Electronic	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	
Preservation Action	Rhonda Sincavage	Electronic	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	
Historic Charleston	Jonathan H. Poston, JD	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Mount Vernon	Dr. Dennis Pogue Esther White	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Colonial Williamsburg Foundation	Dr. Joanne Bowen Dr. Marley R. Brown	Electronic		Liz Crowell	
Consulting Firms					
Hays and Monaghan, Geologists	Daniel Hayes	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
EHT Tracerics	Emily Eig	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
SWSG	Debbie Robison	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
KSK	Dr Petar Glumac Doug Mooney	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Versar	Cynthia Auman	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	

	Dr. Brian Crane Dennis Knepper Chris Bowen				
JMA	Liz Sargent Dr. Donna Seifert Dr. Charles Cheek Joe Balicki Wade Catts	Electronic		Liz Crowell	
Louis Berger Group	Charlie Lee Decker Dr. John Bedell Dr. Stuart Fiedel	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
URS	Dr. Varna Boyd Dr. Emlen Myers George Miller Dr. William Barse	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Geoarchaeology Research Associates	Dr. Joseph Schulenrein	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Thunderbird Archaeology	Dr. Kim Snyder	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates	Martha Williams	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
CONSERVEIT	Lisa Young	Hard Copy and electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
Independent HABS Photographic Consultant	Patrice Gilbert	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Independent Architectural History Consultant	Simone Moffett	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Michael Baker & Associates	Dr. William Johnson	Electronic	1/6/06	Liz Crowell	
Architectural Photographer	Bill Lebovich	Electronic	1/6/06	Liz Crowell	
Gray and Pape	Brad Bowden Mary Lynne Rainey	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Parsons	Susan Bupp Chris Egghart	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
The Ottery Group	Tom Bodor Chris Sperling Victoria Robertson	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
KCI	David Bibler	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	

	Marcia Kodlick				
Ed Otter Consulting Archaeologist	Dr. Ed Otter	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
CRCG	Juddson Kratzer	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Historical Perspectives	Julie D. Abell Nancy Dickinson	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Cultural Site Research and Management	Dr. Douglas Comer	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
EAC Archaeology	Elizabeth Anderson Comer	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Architectural Consultant	Elizabeth Barthold O'Brien	Electronic	1/05/06	Liz Crowell	
EDAW	Margarita Wuellner	Electronic	1/05/06	Liz Crowell	
LaPorta and Associates	Philip LaPorta Dr. Margaret Brewer Dr. Linda Sohl		1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Universities					
Mary Washington University	Dr. Douglas Sanford Dr. Michael Klein	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
		Electronic			
University of Pennsylvania Anthropology (anthro) University Museum (UM)	Dr. Robert Schuyler Elin Danien (UM)	Electronic	12/19/05	Liz Crowell	
University of Iowa	Dr. David Gradwohl	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Towson State	Dr. Robert Wall	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
James Madison University	Dr. Carol Nash	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
College of William and Mary	Dr. Dennis Blanton Dr. Martin Gallivan	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
American University	Dr. Richard J. Dent	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Westchester State (PA)	Dr. Heather Wholey Dr. Marshall Becker	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
University of Indiana	Dr. Henry Glassie	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Cambridge University, UK	Dr. Michael Petraglia	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
University of Delaware	Dr. LuAnn DeCunzo	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
University of Maryland	Dr. Mark Leone	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	

Monmouth College	Dr. Richard Veit	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Rhode Island College	Dr. Peter S. Allen Dr. Pierre Morenon	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Youngstown State University	Dr. Martha Pallante	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Appalachian State University	Dr. Tom Whyte	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Individuals					
Scholar and former Chief Archaeologist, Colonial Williamsburg	Ivor Noel Hume	Hard Copy	1/11/06	Liz Crowell	
Former Delaware State Historic Preservation Officer	Dr. Daniel Griffith	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
CRMPS LTE Employees	Nancy Anthony Cecile Glendening Paul Inashima Jan Sutton	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Graduate Student, Ph.D. program, Syracuse University	David Babson	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Retired curator of Tudor Place	Chris Wilson	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Paleoethnobotanical Analyst	Cissy Pipes	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Paleoethnobotanical Analyst	Justine Woodward McKnight	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Freelance CR Specialist	Diane Halsall	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Retired professor	Dr. June Evans	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Lee Cox	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Volunteer	Janice Grogin	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Historic Preservation Specialist	Janice Artemel	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Friends of Historic Huntley	Barbara Ballentine	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Jack Cresson	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Louis Sardelli	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Kat Guidi	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Bob Meyer	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Nick Lucchetti	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
		Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Retired, National Register of Historic Places and HABS /	Marilyn Harper	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	

Private Architectural Consultant					
Archaeologist and Publisher	Dr. Roger Moeller	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeologist	Dr. Mary Glowacki	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Cultural Resource Specialist	Sulah Milligan	Electronic	1/5/06	Liz Crowell	
Citizen	Bob Lundegard	Electronic and Hard Copy	1/6/06	Liz Crowell	
Citizen	Julie Tahan	Hard Copy	1/6/06	Liz Crowell	
Archaeological Consultant	Paula Bienenfeld	Hard Copy	1/16/06	Liz Crowell	

**Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan
Public Comment Summary**

#	Organization or Individual	Topic of Comment	Element, Issue, or Strategy Referenced	Plan Page	Comment Summary	Comment Status
1	David Gradwohl, Professor and Cemetery Expert	Cemeteries	Cemeteries		<p>I read through the Cemeteries Section of the Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resources Management Plan. I think that section is very well done - - thorough and clearly stated.</p> <p>I want to STRONGLY support the plan's program to conduct intensive archival research to ascertain the location of family and (what were) small rural cemeteries.</p>	No change
2	Dr. Petar D. Glumac Director of Archaeology, KSK Consultants	Overall Plan	Overall Plan		<p>The FFX Co. Cultural Resources Management Plan is well-crafted document that is a credit to the professionalism, experience and expertise of its authors. It presents the key information in a style that is approachable to its intended audience. As befits such a document, the authors not only detail the nature and status of the county's cultural resources but also presents vital suggestions as to how move forward.</p> <p>This document and the efforts it represents, should serve as a role model and benchmark for other county governments.</p> <p>Well done.</p>	No change
3	Dr. Matthew Reeves Director of Archaeology, Montpelier	Overall Plan	Overall Plan		<p>I was excited to receive the CRM plan from you—thanks. It is handy to have as we are working out our master plan for the property here at Montpelier and we are also writing up a CRM plan for a series of Civil War camps that the American Battlefield Protection program gave us a grant to survey here on the property.</p>	No Change

4	Dr. Douglas Comer Principal, Cultural Site Research and Management				I have just scanned this, and I am impressed.	No Change
5	Nancy Kassner DC HPO Archaeologist	Overall Plan Civil War Cemeteries	Overall Plan	p.25 p.46	<p>Very comprehensive and well thought out document.</p> <p>Civil War relic hunters and relic hunters in general: Have you tried to establish a "working" relationship with the looters; perhaps have open discussions with them? I've tried that in DC and found that some of them were open to sharing information about site location (since they seem to know where many sites are); and were open to preservation.</p> <p>Has the County conducted a survey of the cemeteries? Montgomery County has just completed a cemetery survey and has added a number of new and "lost" ones to their inventory.</p>	<p>Addressed</p> <p>Already Addressed</p>
6	Debbie Robison SWSG	Overall Introduction	Overall Plan	p. 3	<p>I had an opportunity to read over the draft of the Cultural Resources Management Plan 2006-2010 this weekend and was impressed to see how much effort went into preparing the plan.</p> <p>Following are my comments, which are generally minor. However, I did want to suggest two additional initiatives: treating big trees as cultural resources and establishing historical research as a plan element. These initiatives are described within my comments.</p> <p>The purpose of the plan was identified differently in two places. See first sentence on page 3 and last sentence on page 4. I suggest blending them. "The purpose of the Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resources Management Plan is to establish goals and define strategies to achieve an important part of the Park Authority resource stewardship and preservation vision: [state the important part of the vision.]"</p>	No Change

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	Introduction (continued)	Overall Plan (continued)		<p>Define overall goals targeted to be achieved by the strategies during this plan period. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protect cultural resources ○ Educate and interpret ○ Stimulate historical research ○ Foster greater involvement of partner organizations, volunteers, and community <p>Add a section listing all the applicable codes, plans, policies, and relevant laws mentioned in the plan, perhaps adding a brief description. I suggest this because the plan describes so many, it starts to get confusing.</p> <p><u>Applicable Codes, Plans, Policies, Guidelines, and Relevant Laws</u></p> <p>Policy Plan Component of the Comprehensive Plan The Heritage Resources Management Plan Section 10.1-2211 of Code of Virginia Section 10.12304 of Code of Virginia Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Park Policy Plan The Code 2232</p>	(Will be included in Appendix)
		Plan Element Cultural Resource Planning	Issue 1	p. 6	Strategy 1.2: Define “County Policy Plan Review”, e.g. The Policy Plan component of the Comprehensive Plan.	No Change
			Issue 2	p. 6	Issue 2: Move point number 6 to the strategy section.	No Change
				p. 7	Strategy 2.1: Consider revising to “Develop assessment procedures and guidelines for parcels slated for land acquisition. Assess parcels prior to their acquisition and provide results to appropriate Planning and Development staff to inform the decision process.”	Addressed
			Issue 3	p. 7	Issue 3 and Issue 5: Consider combining these issues due to similarity.	No Change

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	Cultural Resource Planning (continued)	Issue 4	p. 8	Strategy 4.4: Prepare condition assessments of historic structures on a periodic basis to identify capital improvement needs. Identify anticipated date of end of average life span for building components whose replacement would require capital improvement funds, e.g. roofs.	Addressed	
			Issue 6	p. 10	Strategy 6.6: Identify societies and associations that publish newsletters. Periodically, or as warranted, submit articles for publication.	Addressed	
			Archaeology	Issue 2 Add Strategy	p. 16	Strategy 2.8: Apply for National Register listing for qualified sites not on parkland, e.g. sites developers agree to protect in open space.	Addressed
		Issue 4		p. 17	Issue 4: Move the sentence “Cultural resources are non-renewable...” to Issue 3.	Addressed	
				p. 18	Strategy 4.8: Develop a school field-trip program to archaeology sites.	Addressed	
				Artifacts and Collections	p. 26	Rename plan element to “Plan Element Archaeological Artifacts and Collections.”	Addressed
		p. 27	Develop a plan element for Museum Collections		No Change		
		Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects, and TCPs	Issue 4		p. 32	Strategy 4.3: Severely limit this possibility as a last resort for instances where the importance of interpreting out-weighs the detrimental effect of mimicking history without all the facts. Require that the amount of historical and archaeological documentation be significant.	Addressed
				Historic Overlay Districts	Issue 1 (add strategy)	p. 35	Add to proposed historic overlay districts the expansion of the Centreville HOD.
			p. 37		Strategy 1.5: Verify the accuracy of the historic district designation in GIS for all parcels within historic districts.	Addressed	

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	Listings	Issue 2	p. 37	Coordinate corrections with appropriate agency. (Note: I already did this for Centreville – lots of parcels incorrectly identified as not being in the historic district, even Mount Gilead.)	Addressed
				p. 37	Strategy 2.2: What type of assessment?	No Change
				p. 38	Add another level of significance: listing as a contributing resource in a historic district.	Addressed
		Cemeteries	Issue 3	p. 42	Strategy 3.4: Nominate area for listing as a National Historic District. E.g. Centreville	No Change
			Issue 3 (add strategy)	p. 46	Strategy 3.8: Coordinate updating the listing of cemeteries and their grave marker transcripts that is on the Fairfax County Public Library VA Room website.	Addressed
		Cultural Landscapes	Issue 4	p. 47	Strategy 4.2: What are the management policy and guidelines?	No Change
			Issue 2	p. 50	Strategy 2.2: Add “Include recommendations for GMP resource protection zones in CLR as a map graphic.” Since you don’t want to map archaeological sites, this suggestion will vaguely identify areas discovered during the CLR investigation as not to be disturbed.	Addressed
			Add Issue 5	p. 51	ADD Issue 5 Treat Big Trees as Cultural Resources Big trees are a valuable cultural resource since older trees were a part of the historic landscape. Big trees are trees that are large for their species and generally correlate to being old trees. The location and growth pattern of big trees provides information about historic land use and settlement. For example, big trees with a spreading crown were grown in an open space environment, often near a home site. The Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), Urban Forestry Division,	Addressed

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	Cultural Landscapes (continued)	Add Issue 5 Continued		<p>maintains a Big Tree Registry. A <i>Fairfax County Big Tree Registry: Big Tree Nomination Form</i> is available on the DPWES website.</p> <p>The Virginia Big Tree Database is maintained by the Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Department of Forestry, and the Virginia Tech College of Natural Resources. There are currently 30 Fairfax County big trees listed on the database.</p> <p>Strategy 5.1: Add big trees to GIS. Strategy 5.2: Share information with DPWES and Natural Resources staff in a cooperative effort. Strategy 5.3: Identify big trees and nominate them for big tree registries. Strategy 5.4: Educate the public about the historical value of big trees. Solicit nominations.</p>	
		Education	Issue 1 (add strategy)	p. 60	<p>Strategy 1.17: Develop a community service program for high school students interested in obtaining service hours. Identify specific programs available both at park headquarters, in the local parks, and that can be accomplished from home for students without transportation. (e.g. transcribing historical documents) Post opportunities on the website.</p> <p>FYI – Fairfax County high school students who want to earn a Board of Education Seal for Excellence in Civics Education on their diploma must work 50 community service hours. In addition, many of the honor societies require service hours. I've heard that the History Honor Society requires history related service hours. Many students have no idea where they can go to perform community service.</p>	Addressed
		ADD NEW PLAN ELEMENT: Historical Documentation		??	<p>Historical documentation is gathered when working on specific projects, whether for an archaeological investigation, historic structure report, interpretive plan, land development study, or in preparation of an event. Documentation includes, but is not limited to reports, photos, oral histories, HABS survey forms, chain of</p>	Addressed

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	ADD NEW PLAN ELEMENT: Historical Documentation continued		??	<p>titles, and maps.</p> <p>Issue 1 Centralized Repository</p> <p>Documentation is scattered throughout the county at the James Lee Center, Museum Collections, Department of Planning & Zoning, and at many parks. The documentation is, for the most part, not cataloged. Museum Collections catalogs curated photos.</p> <p>Strategy 1.1: Create a primary centralized repository for historical documentation.</p> <p>Strategy 1.2: Fairfax County Park Authority Historians and other site staff performing historical research shall generate reports, copies of which shall be given to the central repository and the FCPL VA Room.</p> <p>Strategy 1.3: Provide scans of photos in Museum Collections to the FCPL VA Room.</p> <p>Issue 2 Countywide Research</p> <p>Historical research involves interpreting history from a broad context including economics, labor trends, political policy, land settlement patterns, and local architectural styles. Most documentation is prepared for a specific project and is filed by project or park site.</p> <p>Strategy 2.1: Post “most wanted” list of research paper topics on website and coordinate with colleges and high schools.</p> <p>Strategy 2.2: Gather oral histories. Coordinate with Fairfax County History Commission and college professors of oral history classes. Provide copies to the FCPL VA Room. Catalog oral histories.</p> <p>Strategy 2.3: Gather copies of historical documents about Fairfax County from other agencies such as LOC, Library of Virginia, NARA, etc. and place copies in FCPL VA Room.</p> <p>Strategy 2.4: Create a three-ring binder for all Fairfax County HABS documents, a binder for county Southern Claims filings, a</p>	<p>Not added as separate section, but selected ideas incorporated elsewhere in the document</p> <p>No</p>
------------	---------------------------------------	---	--	----	--	---

6 cont.	Debbie Robison SWSG (continued)	ADD NEW PLAN ELEMENT: Historical Documentation (continued)			binder for Sneden watercolors, a binder for all county Mutual Assurance Society Policies, a binder for county original grant surveys, etc. Provide copies to the FCPL VA Room. Strategy 2.5: Conduct seminars to educate the community, including students and genealogists, in how to conduct historical research in Fairfax County. Strategy 2.6: Research correlations between Fairfax County and Jamestown to compliment upcoming celebrations.	
7 cont.	Dennis Knepper Versar	Overall			Looks great. You and your group have obviously put a lot of time and effort into the Management Plan.	No Change
		Introduction		p. 3	This is a good, concise, summary history of CAS and FCPA. Still, it wasn't clear to me from the summary where CAS fits into the current document. The text of the Management Plan refers throughout to FC Parks. CAS originally covered the entire county, if I read the summary correctly – what is its purview now; what is its relationship to FCPA and the new Management Plan?	Addressed
		CR Planning		p. 5	re surveys – do you have provisions anywhere (i.e., in another document) for specific test intervals in surveys – recommended or required STP grid spacing?	No Change (Will be addressed as per strategies)
		Artifacts and Collections		p. 26	re storage space – one means of getting a handle on this would be to accumulate fewer artifacts by developing guidelines on what is to be collected, especially with regard to later 20 th century historical items and non-artifactual materials (e.g., unmodified rocks).	Addressed
		Archaeology		p. 26	re the ReDiscovery software – is this ANCS II or something similar? Is it flexible enough to accommodate databases from a variety of sources (consultants, volunteers, etc.)?	No Change
				p. 12	this section seems to be the only place where GIS is mentioned in any detail. It implies that GIS is not important for other aspects of planning, like architectural history. There are a few mentions later such as “add to GIS layers,” but it seems a little lopsided. I would suggest describing specifically what layers you have for the	Addressed

7 cont.	Dennis Knepper Versar (continued)	Historic Buildings, etc.	Issue 4		different elements (archaeo. sites, Civil War Inventory properties, standing structures, cemeteries, etc.), what they represent, and what they might contain.	
				p. 14	re the 3D model, the first full sentence on page 14 (that starts “The current model...”) contains repetitive phrases that end up sounding slightly trivial.	Addressed
				p. 14	On page 14 the text says “...referred to as a Phase I archaeological survey in federal and state guidelines...” The same phrase appears on page 15 in relation to Phase II archaeological testing, and something similar about Phase III data recovery occurs on page 17. Reading these phrases gives the impression that FCPA does not use the terms Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III. Is that correct, do you refer to them in some other way?	Addressed
				p. 32	page 32 – Issue 4, Interpretation: “It is our mandate to educate the public...” This sounds a little imperative, as if you are going to go out and teach these people whether they like it or not. It might be better to re-phrase the idea as something like “Part of our mandate is to provide educational opportunities...”	Addressed
		Historic Overlay Districts	Issue 5	p. 33	pg 33 – Issue 5, Traditional Cultural Properties: the way things are stated here sounds a little like advocating the perpetuation of inaccuracy. The text says traditions “may not be 100 percent accurate...” but then states that they should be recorded and transcribed. There’s an idea missing in the middle of this. Maybe say something like, although they may be based on anecdotal evidence and are not always fully accurate, they still have value and thus need to be recorded. Are you differentiation between properties and the traditions behind them? The Strategy talks of recording oral history. How will these traditions be applied to actual locations or properties?	Addressed
		Listings		p. 34	These sound like a good idea, as long as they are not misused; i.e., as long as they are not used as an exclusionary mechanism – as in,	No Change

[illegible]

8	Neal McBride Citizen (continued)	Overall (continued)			not enough staff and/or contractor-support resources to actually implement and then maintain over the long haul this or any other CRM Plan in a timely and effective manner. Therefore, I recommend that some kind of statement needs to be made showing the true extra costs of not only fulfilling the mandate being established by all this "Great Stewardship Talk", but that a caveat be added something to the effect that "all bets are off if the County leadership and taxpayers fail/refuse to authorize and appropriate the necessary resources" for this otherwise very exciting CRM Plan. To quote that old lady-philosopher from Wendy's: "Show Me The Beef!"	Address in Implementati on Plan
9	Daniel Sponn Hunter Mill Defense League	Overall			<p>There is no mention in this document on how the County should coordinate preservation activities that are required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Who is the responsible party in the County to coordinate Section 106? This policy states the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section is the steward of cultural resources in the county – yet except in limited situations they are currently not considered a responsible consulting/coordinating party under Section 106. Recent experience in trying to coordinate a Section 106 action for the Oakton Crossroads National Register eligible historic district has shown that there is no County employee to act as preservation spokesperson for the County. The Virginia SHPO believes it is the History Commission. But I question their ability to do this, as they have limited knowledge in the Section 106 process and federal requirements.</p> <p>There is also a significant disconnect between the Section 106 process and the County zoning and development approval process. If the CRM and Protection Section is the steward, they need to have a role in reviewing zoning and development approvals and verifying whether Section 106 is required. And when it is required, the approval process for site plans and other requirements should be deferred until Section 106 requirements have been met. For example, in the case of the Oakton</p>	<p>Addressed New Section Added Under CR Planning</p> <p>No Change</p>

9	Daniel Spohn Hunter Mill Defense League (Continued)	Overall (continued)	Issue 3	p. 32	Crossroads Historic District the BOS did include a development condition that required Section 106 completion before the project could proceed; however, there is no advocate in the County familiar with the process to ensure that developer fully considers preservation options.	Addressed
		Historic Buildings, etc.			In general, it is extremely difficult now to find out who in the County to contact regarding preservation activities. There should be clear web links to the CRM and Protection Section and the role they have. Currently there are no links.	
		Historic Overlay Districts			Section 3.1 mentions the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Section 3.11 mentions mitigation when adverse effects cannot be avoided for National Register Eligible properties. These standards and procedures are generally not widely known within the County. This policy should emphasize that these requirements are not only the responsibility of the Park Authority, but applies also to the BOS, Historic Commission and others in the County making decisions that impact historic properties.	
				p. 34	There is a comment "that development pressures may make it difficult to establish additional historic overlay districts." This is true; however, there are no strategies identified on how to address this, except for making a list of potential historic districts. There is an opportunity with the Hunter Mill Road Corridor and the related but separate Oakton Crossroads Historic District that have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places in 2002 and 2005, respectively. There has been no effort by any County official as of yet to recommend these eligible Historic Districts as County Historic Overlay Districts. This draft policy will not change that reality. The County asserts very little effort in preserving historic resources, even when additional tools, such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are available to encourage a solution that meets both preservation and development needs.	Noted No Change

9	Daniel Sponn continued	Historic Overlay Districts (continued)			<p>Strategies might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making National Register eligible historic districts priority candidates for Historic Overlay Districts. • Identified candidate Historic Overlay Districts should be immediately reviewed and acted upon. <p>The policy should include language that the County will advocate preservation solutions for any proposed changes to National Register eligible and Historic Overlay Districts, which will include avoiding and mitigating adverse effects.</p> <p>There is a heavy emphasis on Civil War and architectural themes in this policy. 20th century resources are important to identify evaluate and protect. Using the Oakton Crossroads Historic District as an example, which will soon be demolished, it contains one of the last surviving early general stores in the County. Likewise, there are resources not yet identified that are important to County residents, particularly different ethnic groups. This policy should also try to be forward thinking in looking at resources that go beyond the Civil War.</p> <p>The second half of the 20th century was a time of the greatest growth and development in the county. Neighborhoods that are over 50 years old are now being redeveloped. These and other 20th century resources should be surveyed and identified now before they are lost. The policy should offer a strategy to accomplish this.</p>	<p>DPZ would need to do; no change</p> <p>No Change</p>
---	---------------------------	---	--	--	---	---

10	Jordan Tannenbaum		CR Planning	p. 10	1. I would specifically mention coordination with the U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, as appropriate, in section 6.5 of the report.	Addressed
			Artifacts and Collections	p. 26	2. I may have missed it but if this plan does not incorporate by reference the NPS Curation Standards (36 CFR Part 79), I recommend it do so.	No Change
			Listings	p. 38	3. What provisions if any are made for treatment of historic properties that meet the National Register Criteria (36 CFR Part 60) but have not yet been registered either by the County or some other entity or individual?	Addressed
11	Friends of Historic Huntley (sent by Barbara Ballentine)	Cultural Resource Planning		p. 8	You and your team have done an excellent job. It is easy to read and seems to be comprehensive. Good luck as you guide it through to approval. Barbara Friend's groups should play a large role in the planning, interpretation and public education of the County's parks. In Element 1 Cultural Resource Planning, friends groups are not mentioned until Issue 4 Capital Improvement Projects, Strategies 4.3 "Work with volunteers, <u>friends groups</u> , and the public to support these projects." Capital Improvement Projects are identified as those funded through voter-approved bond referenda. Friends groups can be helpful in ways other than just encouraging a positive vote for a bond issue. Members of some friends groups have professional expertise which could be helpful to park staff and might augment staff skills.	Addressed
				p. 9	Friends groups could be added to Issue 6 under Element 1: Coordination with other county agencies and other agencies beyond the county.	Addressed

11 cont.	FOHH	Artifacts and Collections		p. 26	Plan Element Artifacts and Collections defines an artifact as any object made, modified or used by people also known as “material culture.” It mentions that archaeological collections differ from museum collections in a number of ways. After that the section seems to be referring to archaeological collections and not museum collections. With the expanded scope of this document over the 1988 document, shouldn’t both types of collections be treated equally?	Not Changed, but explained in text
		Historic Buildings, etc.	Issue 4	p. 32	Plan Element Historic Buildings, etc. Issue 4 <u>Interpretation</u> , page 32 states: “Generally speaking, historic buildings, structures and objects in unstaffed parks are not subject to interpretation.” This is of great concern and should be addressed forcefully. Any park within the FCPA should be interpreted. If no staff is on site interpretation can be by signage. Occasional staff tours on the property should be scheduled to educate the public about the significance of the park.	Addressed
		Listings		p. 38	<u>Edit</u> needed on page 38 under Plan Element Listings. Second paragraph, “The Alexandria Historic District is an example of a National Register Historic District.” There are two districts in Alexandria (Old and Historic and Parker-Gray).	Addressed
		Education	Issue 1	p. 60	<u>Working with the schools</u> is not mentioned until page 60 under Plan Element Education, Issue 1 Providing Stewardship Education, Strategy 1.13. There is no mention that I caught, of working with schools under Plan Element Interpretation. Staff and teachers might find the guides available for preparing lesson plans on the National Park Service web site under “Teaching With Historic Places” helpful. This program has been used successfully with a great variety of historic resources.	Addressed It was included elsewhere and is now included in other locations.

12	Jeff Winstel and Paula Bienenfeld	<p>Overall</p> <p>Request for Glossary and numbering of each element section</p> <p>Overall</p>		<p>The narrative history of cultural resource management and protection in the county helps place the document and let the reader know where the County is now in terms of planning and protection of cultural resources. This could be enhanced with some type of flowchart. Maps identifying the parks and areas covered by the plan would further help orient the reader.</p> <p>Additional reader aids could include a ‘Definitions’ section and a Table of Contents, so that the document is laid out in a more familiar manner, with Section 1.0, Section 1.2, Section 2.0, Section 2.2, etc.</p> <p>The plan is structured according to Plan Elements, Issues and Strategies. The stated purpose of the plan is “to develop or formalize methodologies for the identification, evaluation, management, protection, treatment and interpretation of cultural resources”. An expectation for the reader, based on this statement and the primary three structural elements, could be that different categories of cultural resources would be identified, (archeological resources, cultural landscapes, etc...) as Plan Elements, and the Issues (such as status or effectiveness of current or previous efforts) concerning their “identification, evaluation, management, protection, treatment and interpretation” would be evaluated. Then Strategies would be suggested to continue, improve, reverse, etc., methodologies to address the identified Issues. Although this is the outline for some elements of the plan, it is not consistent throughout the document. The strategies should be more fully defined in terms of the responsible parties and recommended timeframe. As written, they are somewhat vague at times. Perhaps they could be tightened up into explicit SOPs that would help to implement them.</p> <p>The list of Plan Elements in the document includes identification of resource types and identification of documentation, treatment and management strategies. This is</p>	<p>Table of Contents will be included; glossary in appendix</p> <p>No Change; Implementation Plan to be developed separately</p>
----	-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--

12 cont	Jeff Winstel and Paula Bienenfeld	Overall (continued)			<p>somewhat confusing in that some Elements tend to be Issues and vice-versa. Whereas Archeological sites and Cultural Landscapes and resource types, “Listings” is not. Civil War Sites are identified as their own Element, as are Cultural Landscapes – they could both be considered cultural landscapes. Historic Buildings, Structures and Objects could potentially be a rather broad categorization for an Element, but it receives the same status in the plan as a specific type of landscape with a great deal of information (Civil War Sites) and one with very little information (Traditional Cultural Properties). It is apparent that there are many more Civil War Sites in the county than there are Traditional Cultural Properties, but a clear methodology for the establishment of these categories would benefit the plan.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <p>Good discussion of GIS use for archeology predictive modeling.</p> <p>The document states under archeology, that the parkland is only a small fraction of Fairfax County. Human behavior and activities must be based on the entire county and Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has been assigned by the Board of Supervisors the mission of cultural resource survey and evaluation and making recommendations for their protection.</p> <p>This would seem to apply to all cultural resource types, but appears to be limited to the discussion of archeology.</p> <p>In the strategy section, the park authority is to “Examine other agencies approaches to site protection and update the Park Authority approach”. If the County Board of Supervisors has assigned the mission of cultural resource survey and evaluation, should not recommendations be made for other types of resources (more than archeological) and include approaches beyond those of the Park Authority? The jurisdictional lines are somewhat</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>Add language to other Elements</p> <p>No Change</p>
------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	--	---

12 cont	Jeff Winstel Paula Bienenfeld	Civil War Sites			confusing.	
					Non-NR archeological sites (due to lost of integrity, pot-hunting, etc) are still considered significant as public interest sites. Perhaps this can be further developed. Will there be any protection or programming involved?	No Change
					The historic context in this Element section is much more extensive than in the other Elements, and is a history, rather than a descriptive narrative found under the other Elements. For example, there is no historic context (prehistoric or historic) discussed in the archeology Element.	No Change
		Historic Buildings, etc.			The historic context section could appear after the discussion of the development of the program in Fairfax County. Contexts could be tiered off the state historic context but tailored to Fairfax County; the Civil War history write-up that is in the Civil War Sites Element could go there, so that the Civil War Sites Element would focus on issues and strategies. The issues are good to see, especially the issue of curation and maintenance of artifacts.	
			Issue 4	p. 24	Interpretation issue – is the justification for this due to the Park Authority Plan? How is this tied into Heritage Tourism, or is it only the interest of local residents who use the parks?	No Change
			Issue 1	p. 30	Historic Resources Survey – Issue 1 – Why is this a separate layer for architectural significance?	No Change
			Issue 2 Strategy 2.1	p. 31	Strategies 2.1 Initiate a program to evaluate...this should be coordinated with the Virginia SHPO and their Certified Local Government program, along with the county planning division.	In Coordination with DPZ
			Issue 3	p. 31	Fairfax County Park Authority Policy 205: Guidelines were established by the National Trust – is this correct? I wasn't aware that the National Trust for Historic Preservation (?) established guidelines for the treatment of historic resources – I believe this is the domain of the National Park Service and the Secretary of the	Cannot change Park Policy in this document

12 cont	Jeff Winstel Paula Bienenfeld	Historic Buildings, etc. (cont.)	Issue 3 (continued)	p. 31	Interior. C. “Every reasonable care and expense is justified to approximate in new work the materials, methods and quality of old construction”. This is very inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, #9: “The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment”. D. “Modern uses should be consistent with the preservation of the building’s value – attributing values to preservation may be problematic as it seems highly subjective. The above referenced Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, #1 recommend: “new uses that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment”, which provides a more objective approach. Mitigation should also reference re-design, relocating a project, or scaling it back.	No Change To be done as part of strategy
			Issue 4	p. 32	3.1 Aren’t the Standards for rehabilitation a part of the Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties? 3.2.1 There should be some statement on how to prioritize the buildings needing Historic Structure Reports, such as current condition, or projected use. 3.13 “Seek and set aside funding for protection and treatment of...” -- this should probably be an issue or somehow incorporated into the overall strategy for the management of cultural resources rather than a statement at the end of a list of much more specific strategies.	
				pp. 32-33	Interpretation What about coordinating with local schools for lesson plans, field	

12 cont	Jeff Winstel Paula Bienenfeld	Historic Buildings, etc. (continued)	Issue 5		trips – or is this already done?	Elsewhere
					Perhaps tourism initiatives could be coordinated with the county or local Convention and Visitors Bureau.	
				p. 33	Issue 5 – Traditional Cultural Properties -- See #38 “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties”. This seems very thin, perhaps too small of a concern to justify the topic as an Element heading. I wonder if the resource discussed is best thought of as a Traditional Cultural Property.	No Change
		Historic Overlay District		p. 34	Historic District Overlays – Currently half of the identified resources in this category are in private ownership (?) and the other half (6) are in public ownership, with only one (Manassas) not in county park district ownership. The historic district overlay would not impact Manassas, as it is a unit of the NPS. It would seem that the privately owned sites would be the resources impacted by an overlay. A discussion of jurisdictional authority for an overlay would be helpful.	No Change

13	Nancy Anthony	Archaeology		p. 15	<p>Generally well-presented material.</p> <p>On page 15, top paragraph, the last sentence of the paragraph starts, "Shovel test pits measure some 50 centimeters in diameter..." Is this measurement based on guidelines, such as state or county, or on general experience? Is this a surface measurement? No distinction is made between dimensions of round or square test pits. Should one be made?</p>	Addressed
14	Justin Patton Prince William County Archaeologist	Archaeology		p. 17	<p>I finally completed a review of your document. It's quite impressive and comprehensive, and I think you and John covered all of the bases. I have one recommendation. On Page 17, 1st paragraph, I recommend using Section 4f language or something to the effect, i.e. all feasible alternatives must be explored to avoid adverse effects to significant sites. I think this should be carried through the entire document when talking about cultural resources on park land or owned or leased by FCPA.</p> <p>I think that's all. By the way, I will probably borrow some concepts in developing the components of my program and also when I do the next comprehensive plan update.</p> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to contribute.</p>	Addressed
15	Carol L. Turner Citizen	Overall			<p>So sorry it has taken me so long to get my comments back to you on the Draft Cultural Resource Management Plan. I thought the draft plan was very good and ambitious. Hopefully, you will get enough funding to carry out all the much needed inventorying of artifacts that you have collected and stored. It's obvious that you are understaffed and under funded</p> <p>Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to comment and read your Draft Plan. I'm so glad that the County has a division with folks like you, who are employed in trying to keep the county's cultural history alive.</p>	

16	Dick Sheil Citizen	Not Applicable to CRM Plan			I think the Fairfax County does a great job it their wide programs. I have suggested a morning activity to a couple of the Park groups of an activity for seniors but have been unable to develop much interest. It is an activity for seniors to promote exercise and an enjoyable sport activity at minimal cost. Pickleball a sport that is the fastest growing game in the country. You can go on line www.Pickleball.com to see and read how the sport is played . I really think some thought should be given to including this activity into your programs.	N/A
17	Len Winter Department of the Navy	Introduction Cultural Resource Planning	Issue 2	p. 3	A few typos...a few comments...a few questions! I hope this furthers an excellent study. Len. Paragraph 3, Last sentence: change “This includes” to “These include”	Addressed
				p. 4	Recommend consistent use of “historic properties”, “significant” and “important”	Ok
				p. 6	Be consistent about upper case and lower case in cultural resource	Ok
					5. Change “Evaluation” to “Identification”, since “evaluation “ plays as a NRHP buzzword.	Addressed
				p. 7	Paragraph 3 Sentence 2: Change “determine” to “assess”. “Determine” is active and finite. I would recommend “assess”.	Addressd
			Issue 5	p. 9	Paragraph 1, last sentence: Change “limit significant impacts to “mitigate impacts” or delete significant.	Addressed
				p. 9	Define “By -right” and proffers	In glossary
					Questioned if there were satellite offices to JLC	
			Issue 6 Strategy 6.2	p. 9	Regarding “professional camaraderie” “At the Navy, this is often perceived as a negative; i.e., the issue of fraternizing with	Not applicable

17 cont.	Len Winter Department of the Navy	Cultural Resource Planning (continued)	Issues 6 and 7	p. 10	regulators, associations, etc.” Regarding “preservation” and “protection”: “Another buzzword for Navy, as we are charged to ‘take into account’ and not necessarily preserve. Can imagine that your PWC folks often butt heads with you.”	Not applicable
			Background	p. 11	Should be “listed <u>in</u> the National Register”, not “listed <u>on</u> ...”	Addressed
				p. 12	Regarding Policy 200 “How nice!”	N/A
		Archaeology	Issue 1	p. 13	Paragraph 3, Line 1: Should Resources be plural? Everything else has been singular. Is this correct.	Addressed
			Issue 2	p. 16	Regarding public significance: “An administrative conundrum!”	N/A
			Issue 3	p. 17	2 nd paragraph: “Do you want to include DHR overview here and convey a bigger boogeyman?”	
			Issue 4	p. 17	First sentence: “I recommend delete here. It is more pejorative than not.”	Addressed
					Paragraph 2. Regarding “This heritage can bring all of the ethnic groups together.” And “common cultural heritage”: Overreaching.	No Change
			Strategy 4.5	p. 18	Replace “cement” with “convey”.	Addressed
			Issue 7	p. 25	“25 USC allows us to nail violators against the Fed. Does the County have similar that could be posted?”	N/A
		Civil War Sites	Issue 1	p. 28	“I’ll be real interested in seeing.....and discussing.....your de-X procedures. We’re trying to think the same.”	N/A
		Artifacts and Collections	Add, as Strategy 1.2	p. 28	“Discuss deaccession as a measure to promote larger curation.”	Addressed

17 cont.	Len Winter	Historic Buildings, etc.	Issue 2	p. 28	Paragraph 2: Circled “3-million artifacts” and put an exclamation point. !	N/A
			Issue 5	p. 33	Circled “Mosby’s Rock”. “Why is it considered a TCP? I take it then that there are <u>NO</u> Native American or African American sites... at least none that has been revealed?”	Addressed
		Historic Overlay Districts	Issue 1	p. 36	Sentence 1: Any suits predicated on this argument?”	N/A
				p. 37	“Develop a list of CATEX [categorical exclusions]. This might go a long way in assuring owners that preservation is not necessarily onerous.”	No Change
		Listings	Strategy 1.6	p. 38	Regarding FC Inventory, VLR and NRHP: “Do you find that this tripartite scheme confuses owners? Do you need to inform people that ‘local’ and ‘state’ can still go to ‘national’?”	No Change
					Paragraph 2, first sentence: Add “buildings”	Addressed
				p. 40	Highlight “inform residents of the county of stewardship benefits”.	
				p. 41	Circled “on parkland”. Circled “listing of non-park properties” Comment “(Out of Scope)”	No Change
			Issue 1	p. 43	Paragraph 3, Line 1: Insert “or” between “unmarked” and “marked”	Addressed
			Issue 2	p. 44	“Adding VA Code Citations re: ‘Violation of Sepulchre’ is usually good to put the fear in God in them!	Addressed
				p. 45	“Invoke state, not county or municipal”	Addressed
				p. 45	First paragraph under Issue 2 Protection, Line 4, add “willfully” between “to” and “remove”	Addressed
		Cemeteries	Background			
				p. 49	“enslaved peoples” “p.c.?”	No Change

17 cont.	Len Winter	Cultural Landscapes	Strategy 1.2	p. 54	Paragraph 1: Change “incidences” to “incidents”	Addressed
		Human Impacts	Issue 2	p. 54	Change Human “Erosion” to Human “Impacts” (et seq.)	No Change
			Issue 3	p. 56	Consult 800.12	Addressed
			Issue 4	p. 58	Paragraph 4, Line 3: Consider changing “varying” to “various” Paragraph 4, Line 4: Change “background” to “backgrounds”	Addressed
		Stewardship Education	Issue 1	p. 59	Change “used” to “use”	Addressed
			Strategy 1.2	p. 59	“Would archaeological field school count for teacher recertification? Line 2: Strike ‘need to’; Line 3: Strike ‘would have to’. Add ‘could’. Would class link to SOLs?”	Addressed
			Strategy 1.5			
			Strategy 1.6	p. 59	“include incentives and assistance” “!”	Addressed
			Strategy 1.9	p. 59	Line 2: strike “for training”	Addressed
			Strategy 1.13	p. 60	Last line of strategy; “Should be ‘after-school’.”	Addressed

18	Chris Ramey (Citizen and Volunteer)				<p>As a County volunteer, I am pleased to see the Fairfax County Park Authority Resource Management Division CR Plan taking shape for 2006 and beyond.</p> <p>I am concerned, however, that the future groundwork for a Fairfax County Museum or an on-line computer exhibit be firmly included in the Plan.</p> <p>The Fairfax County Resource Management Division with their fine set of archaeologists and staff certainly has the expertise and artifacts to set the groundwork for future main county museum or regional museums within county districts. All of which would ensure ownership and education of the public for future generations.</p> <p>Two county supervisors, Mike Frey and Sharon Bulova and possible others are receptive to the museum start-up. Further, Virginia Congressman Tom Davis has hinted partial state funding for this concept.</p> <p>The existing County Visitor Centers and/or possible space in the Massey Building could house a temporary fix until the future financing, staff are set aside for a permanent solution. Also lets not forget the former Lorton prison sites potential or the Centreville location near the proposed Mount Gilead park.</p> <p>Finally, the idea of an ongoing Fairfax County archaeology dig, such s a prehistoric Indian site or 17th century Fairfax County Town or Colchester are intriguing.</p>	<p>Addressed</p> <p>Addressed</p>
19	Ed Wenzel Chantilly Battlefield Association	Civil War Sites	Background	<p>p. 19</p> <p>p. 20</p> <p>p. 20</p>	<p>Paragraph 4: “Use northern Virginia with a small ‘n’”</p> <p>Paragraph 2: “Add Chain Bridge Road after Little River Turnpike and before Columbia Turnpike.</p> <p>Paragraph 5: “After 32,000 troops, add ‘supplied by a ‘military railroad specially constructed from Manassas Junction.’”</p>	<p>Addressed</p> <p>Addressed</p> <p>Addressed</p>

19 cont.	Ed Wenzel Chantilly Battlefield Association' (continued)	Civil War Sites (continued)	Background (continued)	p. 20	Last Paragraph: "Rappahannock (sp)"	Corrected
				p. 20	Last Paragraph: "Line 3, say 'The Union Army of the Potomac moved via transport ships to the Virginia Peninsula and tried to capture.....'"	Addressed
				p. 20	Last Paragraph: "Line 4, say '....another Union army, the Army of Virginia, under General Pope, moved west....'"	Addressed
				p. 20	Last Paragraph: "Line 4, delete 'supply, based. Change to 'supply base'"	Addressed
				p. 20	Last Paragraph: "Line 5, after '...unprotected' insert sentence 'Stonewall Jackson's troops flanked Pope's army, captured the rail junction and burned Pope's supply trains.'"	Addressed
				p. 21	Paragraph 2: "Line 2 '...regrouped on the fortified heights at Centreville.'"	Addressed
				p. 21	Paragraph 2: "Line 2, add 'To flank the federal troops from their strong Centreville position, Confederate General Stonewall...'"	Addressed
				p. 21	Paragraph 2: "Line 5 delete 'a small force'. Add 'Two understrength divisions led by...'"	Addressed
				p. 21	Paragraph 2: "Line 6 insert '...surprised <u>and attacked</u> the larger Confederate force...'"	Addressed
				p. 21	Paragraph 2: "Line 7 after 'battleline' add sentence 'Stevens was supported by Major General Philip Kearny's division.'"	Addressed
				p. 22	Paragraph 2: "Line 1 '...northern Virginia...'"	Addressed
				p. 22	Paragraph 4: "Line 2 '...received and processed...(not prosecuted)'"	Addressed
			Issue 1	p. 22	Paragraph 5: "Line 6 after 'he Inventory,' change to read	Addressed

19 cont.	Ed Wenzel Chantilly Battlefield Association (continued)	Civil War Sites (continued)	Issue 1 (continued)	p. 22	'...while not yet completed, represents the first step in identifying the County's Civil War sites. Thus far, 850 sites have been identified.'	
			Issue 2	p. 23	Paragraph 3: "Item 2.7 Add full name of Bull Run Civil War Round Table"	Addressed
			Issue 3	p. 24	Paragraph 1: "Line 2 '...shape file...' correct term"	Yes, No Change
			Issue 4	p. 24	Paragraph 3: "Add Item 4.8 'Meet with editorial staff of local newspapers to request that Civil War sites and history not be confined to, or compartmented in, only one or two local editions (i.e. Chantilly and Centreville). Instead, news and issues pertaining to the county's Civil War sites and heritage should be reported in al editions throughout the county, so that residents everywhere are informed when these sites are in the news, are saved, or as often happens, are threatened.' 'It does not help the protection of cultural resources if only a small fraction of the county's population is ever informed about news of Civil War sites or threatened sites. Editors must be made aware that Civil War history interests folks in Great Falls, Mclean, Vienna, Reston and Springfield too, not just the residents of Centreville or Chantilly. Threats to Civil War Sites and other historic resources should be <u>everybody's</u> business.	No Change
			Issue 7	p. 25	Paragraph 5. "I disagree with the second sentence. First, it's unenforceable. Secondly, it doesn't make sense. If the county could somehow keep relic hunters off of private property then thousands of artifacts would <u>never</u> be found. They would be bulldozed, lost and destroyed in the inevitable development and redevelopment that will continuously occur. For example, the Centennial Gateway LP paid for an archeological survey on the Ox Hill battlefield before the Fairfax Towne Center was constructed. The survey found absolutely <u>nothing</u> from the Civil War battle. Yet, in December 1993, relic hunters came on	Added text

19 cont.	Ed Wenzel Chantilly Battlefield Association (continued)	Civil War Sites (continued)	Issue 7 (continued)	<p>p. 25 site and found hundreds of artifacts. Two relic hunters that I engaged for the Chantilly Battlefield Association found 13 fired minieballs and a brass button from a Union officer's coat which I am holding for the county. There were dozens of relic hunters on the site over a two-week period and they all found artifacts as reported to me by the gentleman I engaged. To promote a no relic hunting policy on a countywide basis (it would not be adhered to) would ensure that nothing is ever recovered anywhere and no one would learn anything.</p> <p>I would recommend that the Park Authority reach out to relic hunters, recognize that they have great value in uncovering artifacts that would never be found otherwise. I would provide them with archaeological guidelines, data grids, ID forms, information on how to benefit future generations. These guys are not all bad. They're not all grave robbers. They shouldn't be treated that way. I would go to their meetings and make peace, not war. Their interest in relic hunting is an asset for the county on countless construction sites and properties where, but for them, these relics would be lost forever. What many of them practice is commonly referred to as 'salvage archeology'".</p> <p>p. 25 Paragraph 6: "Item 7.1 The 'Don't Pocket the Past' campaign of years ago alienated relic hunters and made them hostile to archeologists and the Park Authority. I wouldn't go down that road again. Post the signs on parkland and reference them to parkland, but don't imply that the FCPA thinks relic hunting on private land or construction sites countywide is something that it wants to stop. This will backfire. If artifacts are not searched for, or not found, and are left 'in situ' for the future, then they will likely never be found and will be lost in future waves of development and redevelopment. Examples: The wholesale destruction by developers of Civil War artifacts and the remains of Civil War winter quarters throughout the Centreville area; and the development of Ox Hill battlefield. It was relic hunters, not archeologist, who salvaged what they could, photographed what they could and even found the graves of soldiers. These people</p>	<p>Addressed Strategy 7.4</p> <p>Added text</p>
-------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------	---	---

19 cont.	Ed Wenzel Chantilly Battlefield Association (continued)	Civil War Sites (continued)	Issue 7 (continued)	p. 25	are not the enemy. The enemy is the perpetual onslaught of developers and development and the inability of the county planners to plan for and save anything except for more development.”	No Change
		Overall		p. 25	<p>“Add Item 7.3 ‘Work with developers and county planners to cluster or relocate development to less sensitive areas in order to protect Civil War sites. The transfer of development rights to other parcels, an increase in density at other locations, or outright acquisition by the county of significant land should be among the tools that the county could use to protect its history and heritage.’</p> <p>Private destruction, by commercial developers, of the county’s Civil War heritage sites should not be permitted. Removal of significant artifacts from the ground, even during archaeological surveys, results in the destruction of the actual site. Piling up bricks and artifacts on a shelf at a county storage facility so that the developer can build on an historic site is no longer acceptable. The County and its leaders must devise ways to thwart the loss of important historic resources. Developers and speculators, clinging to their ‘private property rights’ have destroyed far too much of the county’s heritage already.</p> <p>Liz, this is an excellent section on Civil War sites. What I found was only nit-picking. But I hope a few word changes here and there will make it better. I didn’t have time to read the whole document, but I did skim through it. It looks great. Thanks for sending the draft.</p>	

20	Martha Williams Goodwin and Associates	Introduction		p. 3	Editorial and word choice comments	Addressed
		CR Planning	Overall	p. 3	Change to “The document complements the N.R.M. Plan, which...”	Addressed
				p. 4	Note that County Archaeological Services as part of the Office of Comprehensive Planning was limited to archaeological resources only.	Addressed
				pp. 5-10	Editorial and word choice comments	Addressed
				Issue 4	Paragraph 2: Put last sentence first	Addressed
				Issue 5	Note there have been no comprehensive surveys of parkland	Addressed
				Issue 6		
				p. 8	Combine with Issue 2	No Change
				p. 8	Combine with Issue 3	No Change
				p. 9	No formal vehicle exists for coordinating with these folks anyway?	No Change
		Archaeology	Overall	pp. 11-18	Editorial and word choice comments	Addressed
			Background	p. 11	Last sentence of Paragraph 2, Paragraph 3 and first two sentences of Paragraph 4 circled. “Repetitive”	No Change (purposely)
				p. 12	Move first paragraph right before Issue 1	No Change
			Issue 2	p. 14	Questions why first paragraph is needed here	No Change
				p. 15	Quote from National Register “Refer to your appendices here”	No Change

20 cont.	Martha Williams Goodwin and Associates (continued)	Civil War Sites	Issue 4	p. 16	Delete quote	No Change
				p. 17	No initiative directed at schools? Come on!!	Addressed
			Background	p.18	4.4 same as 4.1	Addressed
					Why are these sites different from any other sites?	No Change
				pp. 19-25	Editorial and word choice comments	Addressed
						No
				p. 19	Delete paragraphs 3-6	No
				p. 20	Delete entire page	No
				p. 21	Delete paragraphs 1-5	No
				p. 22	Delete paragraphs 1-4	No
		Artifacts and Collections	Issue 2	p. 23	Why separated from Issue 1?	No Change
			Background	pp. 26-29	Editorial and word choice comments	Addressed, where appropriate
				p. 27	Paragraph 2 Do we need all this?	No Change
		Historic Buildings	Issue 1	p. 28	Note that space at James Lee will be inadequate soon.	Addressed
				p. 28	Add Strategy 1.4 Cull collections	Already addressed
		Historic Overlay Districts	Issue 3	p. 31	Are there policies that apply to built resources?	Addressed
			Background	p. 34	Delete quote	No Change
				p. 35	Put descriptions of HODs first	No Change

20	Martha Williams (continued)	Listings	Issue 1	p. 36	Add Strategy: Inform public of how HODs are established.	Addressed
			Issue 2	p. 37	Add strategy: Actively solicit nominations for HODs from members of the public and public interest groups.	No Change
			Background Issue 1	p. 38 p. 39	Delete quote Need to discuss the development of contexts.	No No Change
				p. 40	What are stewardship benefits?	No Change
			Issue 2	p. 40	Switch order of 2.1 and 2.3	No Change
			Issue 3	p. 42	Do ARB and History Commission review draft NR nominations?	Sometimes, no change
		Cemeteries	Background	p. 43	Add introductory sentence to paragraph 4 that says: Both federal and state laws relate to the treatment of cemeteries as historic resources.	Addressed
			Issue 1	p. 44	Change order of sentences in Paragraph 1	Addressed
					Are we talking a new county ordinance here?	Imp. Plan
			Issue 2	p. 45	Train police	Addressed
		Cultural Landscapes	Issue 3	p.46	Strategy 3.5 Add remote sensing and archival research	Addressed
			Background	p. 48	Delete Paragraph 2	No
			Issue 1	p. 49	Why is Scotts Nature Preserve a heritage resource?	No Change
			Issue 2	p. 50	A treatment plan is a <u>component</u> of a CLR.	Yes
			Issue 3	p. 50	Restate Issue	No Change
			Issue 4	p. 51	Restate Issue	No Change

20	Martha Williams continued	Human Impact continued	Issue 1	p. 52	Last paragraph: Does this belong in Introduction?	No Change
			Issue 3 continued	p. 55	Paragraph 4: What is the relationship of encroachment to resources?	Addressed
				p. 55	Paragraph 5: Too preachy!!	No Change
		Education	Issue 4	p. 56	There are different levels of threat that can or cannot be dealt with. Be realistic – if we have a nuclear disaster or another 9/11, we probably will not be dealing with cultural resources!	Text Changed
				P. 57	Move stewardship definition and mission to before the description of SET.	No Change
			Issue 1	p. 58	Delete paragraph 4.	No
21	Wayne Clark Chief, Office of Museum Services, Maryland Historical Trust				Just wanted to send you a thank you note for sending along the excellent Fairfax County Preservation Plan. Its great to continue to see Fairfax County as a model for the other 99 counties in Virginia for the fair consideration of the preservation of the County’s historic, standing structure and archaeological heritage. The Civil War component is a model for planning to document and preserve a sample of the best sites for the 150th anniversary observations in the not to distant future 2011 to 2015. Goal of Virginia should be to have 20 percent of Virginia counties to establish county preservation programs like yours in the next ten years. Greatest opportunities and best preservation and education results continues to be at the local level in Virginia and Maryland, in my opinion. Sincerely, Wayne 410-586-8511	No Change (Nice Comments)
22	Friends of Colvin Run Mill				<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Friends has previously taken the position that the existing process of improving our cultural resources needs improvement, so a new, well founded Cultural	

22 cont.	Friends of Colvin Run Mill continued				<p>Resource Management Plan will be a big step forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft is not really a plan, but rather an assembly of issues. A plan should state objectives, approaches and recommend actions. • The Friends current interest is primarily in Element 1, Issues 2 and 4; and Element 5, Historic Buildings. • In the context of Elements 1 and 5, the Friends recommends that the Management Plan incorporate the concepts and recommendations of the Needs Assessment Survey, particularly Appendix X. • More generally, the Friends recommends that a regular schedule be established for master plan review and revision for all historic sites and nature centers. This needs to be done as a basis for financial planning and not as a consequence of budget decision. • The Friends recommends that the reviewed plan be redone as an action-oriented plan, and not merely as a description of extant issues. 	<p>No Change</p> <p>Considered</p> <p>Not in our purview</p> <p>Will be addressed by the Implementation Plan</p>
-------------	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Fairfax County Park Authority
Cultural Resource Management Plan 2006-2010



Fairfax County Park Authority
April 26, 2006
DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

Fairfax County Park Authority Board

Harold L. Strickland.....Chairman, Sully District
Joanne E. Malone..... Vice Chairman, Providence District
Frank S. Vajda.....Secretary-Treasurer, Mason District
Edward Batten, Sr. Lee District
William Bouie.....Hunter Mill District
Kevin Fay.....Dranesville District
Kenneth Feng..... Springfield District
Gilbert S. McCutcheon..... Mt. Vernon District
Winifred S. Shapiro..... Braddock District
Harrison A. Glasgow..... At-Large
Georgette Kohler..... At-Large
George E. Lovelace..... At-Large

Park Authority Director's Leadership Team

Mike Kane..... Director
Tim White..... Deputy Director
Seema Ajrawat..... Fiscal Administrator, Financial Management
Charlie Bittenbring..... Director, Park Services Division
Bob Brennan..... Executive Director, Park Foundation
Todd Johnson..... Director, Park Operations Division
Leslie Amiri..... Director, Human Capital Development
Nick Duray..... Marketing Manager, Marketing, Research and Planning
John Finegan..... Manager, Automated Services Branch
Sandy Stallman..... Branch Manager, Park Planning Branch
Elisa Lueck..... Management Analyst, Director's Office
Cindy Messinger..... Director, Resource Management Division
Miriam Morrison..... Director, Administration Division
Judy Pedersen..... Public Information Officer
Lynn Tadlock..... Director, Planning and Development Division

Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan Project Team

Liz Crowell, Project Manager
Resource Management Division

Resource Management Division

Mike Henry
Ann Korzeniewski
Karen Lindquist
Mike McCaffrey
Carol McDonnell
Cindy Messinger
Jeanne Niccolls
Michael Rierson
John Rutherford
Richard Sacchi
Marty Smith
Katarina Spears
Terry Tomasulo
Bob Wharton

Planning and Development Division

Irish Grandfield
Kirk Holley
Kay Rutledge
Sandy Stallman

Director's Leadership Team

Bob Brennan
Judy Pedersen

Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning

Linda Blank

Fairfax County Architectural Review Board

John Burns

Park Operations Division

Matthew Devor
Bruce Williams

Park Services Division

Gary Logue
Lee Ann Shenefiel

Fairfax County History Commission

Barbara Naef

Production and Editing

C.K. Gailey
Christine Mead

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	v.
Introduction	1

Plan Elements

Cultural Resource Planning	3
• Background	3
• Issue 1: Heritage Resource Management Plan	3
• Issue 2: Cultural Resource Surveys on Parkland	4
○ Land Acquisition	5
○ Park Master Planning	5
• Issue 3: Cultural Resource Surveys for Development Plan Review and Zoning Change Applications	6
• Issue 4: Capital Improvement Projects	6
• Issue 5: Coordination with Department of Planning and Zoning and Office of Site Development Services Staff	7
• Issue 6: Coordination with Other Agencies	8
• Issue 7: Define and Develop Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section Best Practices	8
• Issue 8: Review of Section 106, Section 4(f) and NEPA Documents	9
Archaeology	11
• Background	11
• Issue 1: Geographic Information System (GIS) Assessment	12
• Issue 2: Survey and National Register Evaluation	15
• Issue 3: Protection and Treatment	17
• Issue 4: Interpretation	17
Civil War Sites	19
• Background	19
• Issue 1: Civil War Sites Inventory	22
• Issue 2: Additional Civil War Site Identification, Evaluation, Protection and Treatment	23
• Issue 3: Use of GIS	24
• Issue 4: Interpretation	24
• Issue 5: Freedom of Information Act Exemption	25
• Issue 6: Categorization and Prioritization	25
• Issue 7: Protection	26
Archaeological Artifacts and Collections	27
• Background	27
• Issue 1: Storage Space	28
• Issue 2: Consolidation of Collections	29
• Issue 3: Staffing	30
• Issue 4: Documentation	30
• Issue 5: Exhibit and Display	31
Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects and Traditional Cultural Properties	32
• Background	32
• Issue 1: Survey	32
• Issue 2: Evaluation	32
• Issue 3: Protection and Treatment	33

• Issue 4: Interpretation.....	35
• Issue 5: Traditional Cultural Properties.....	35
Fairfax County Historic Overlay Districts	36
• Background.....	36
• Issue 1: Inform the Public about Implications of Construction in Historic Overlay District.....	39
• Issue 2: Establish Additional Historic Overlay Districts to Protect Important Historic Properties.....	40
Listings	41
• Background.....	41
• Issue 1: Modifications to the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites.....	42
• Issue 2: Nominations to the Virginia Landmarks Register.....	43
• Issue 3: National Register of Historic Places Listing.....	43
Cemeteries	46
• Background.....	46
• Issue 1: Development.....	47
• Issue 2: Protection.....	48
• Issue 3: Identification and Documentation.....	49
• Issue 4: Cemetery Management and Guidelines.....	50
Cultural Landscapes	51
• Background.....	51
• Issue 1: Definition, Importance and Benefits of Cultural Landscape Reports.....	51
• Issue 2: Treatment and Maintenance Plans for Cultural Landscapes	52
• Issue 3: Participants.....	53
• Issue 4: How to Use.....	54
• Issue 5: Treat Big Trees as Cultural Resources	54
Human Impact on Cultural Resources	56
• Background.....	56
• Issue 1: Development.....	56
• Issue 2: Relic Hunting/Vandalism.....	57
• Issue 3: Human Erosion.....	59
• Issue 4: Natural Hazard and Human Action Disaster Impact.....	60
Education.....	61
• Background.....	61
• Issue 1: Providing Stewardship Education.....	62

Appendices

I Glossary.....	65
II Policy and Regulatory Back ground.....	71
• County Policies and Regulations.....	71
• State Regulations and Guidelines	71
• Federal Regulations, Guidelines and Policies.....	71

*An Executive Summary will be provided in this location for the April 26, 2006 final version.

Executive Summary Continued

Introduction

The purpose of the Fairfax County Park Authority Cultural Resource Management Plan is to coordinate agency-wide efforts to achieve an important part of the Park Authority resource stewardship and preservation vision. (The document complements the Natural Resource Management Plan, which was completed in FY 2004 and began its implementation phase in FY 2005.) Because every Park Authority employee and every Fairfax County citizen can play a role in achieving this vision, the Cultural Resource Management Plan is written for a broad audience. Each of the Plan's 11 elements includes a background section to introduce the topic, as well as the issues addressed and strategies proposed by the plan.

The Fairfax County Park Authority is the county's largest landowner (with over 23,000 acres in more than 380 parks) and, as such, much of the responsibility for preserving and protecting cultural resources county-wide rests with the Park Authority. The Park Authority holds this heritage as a public trust to preserve for current and future generations.

History of Cultural Resource Management and Protection in Fairfax County

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section of the Fairfax County Park Authority is the entity that conducts archaeological and other cultural resource studies county-wide, and therefore is the primary steward of cultural resources in the county. Cultural Resources are defined as physical evidence of any past human activity identifiable through field survey, historical documentation or oral history. These include archaeological sites, historic buildings, structures, objects or districts, cemeteries and cultural landscapes.

The Fairfax County Park Authority has maintained a program in historic preservation since the mid-1960s after Sully and Colvin Run Mill were established as historic sites. Archaeology and cultural resource protection have been a formal component of the county government since 1978, when the Fairfax County History Commission initially sponsored County Archaeological Services. It operated as a component of the Heritage Resource Branch of the Office of Comprehensive Planning (which is now the Department of Planning and Zoning). Its primary mission was *"the identification, recording and mitigation of cultural resource sites located on parcels subject to rezoning and special exception plan review."* County Archaeological Services addressed archaeology only, with other specialties addressed by other preservation professionals in the Heritage Resource Branch. In 1987, the Fairfax County Park Authority Division of Historic Preservation established a Cultural Resource Management Office. Its primary mission was *"the identification, protection, management and interpretation of cultural resources located and preserved within parks and on potential parkland."*

In 1996, the Heritage Resource Branch was abolished and County Archaeological Services was transferred to the Resource Management Division of the Fairfax County Park Authority. A Memorandum of Understanding was drawn up at that time, which

indicated that the Park Authority would continue to conduct the functions previously performed by County Archaeological Services, in addition to protecting cultural resources on parkland. County Archaeological Services staff continued to conduct county-wide plan reviews and conduct excavations on threatened sites. From 1996 through 2003, County Archaeological Services and Cultural Resource Protection continued to operate more or less independently of each other. In 2003, the two groups were consolidated as part of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section. Section Staff still perform county-wide services, as well as managing and protecting cultural resources on parkland. In the summer of 2004, all members of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff were moved to the newly-renovated James Lee Center, where its offices, resource facility, labs and storage are located.

Cultural Resource Management Planning in Fairfax County

In the 1980s, the staff of County Archaeological Services recognized the need to establish a planning document that set forth research priorities for archaeological studies conducted in the county. A team was established that produced the *Heritage Resource Management Plan*. In 1988, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors adopted the county's *Heritage Resource Management Plan*. The Plan embodied an approach that allowed for the protection and preservation of the county's significant heritage resources over the long term. The *Heritage Resource Management Plan* was developed as part of a 1980s cultural resource planning effort known as RP³ (Resource Preservation, Protection and Planning) established by the National Park Service. The approach called for the establishment of a framework to evaluate resources and for the development of research priorities for cultural resources in a given area. The *Heritage Resource Management Plan* is part of the Comprehensive Plan and allows for consideration of cultural resources during the development plan review process; however, its scope was limited to archaeological resources only.

This Document

The present Cultural Resource Management Plan addresses the range of cultural resource topics (Elements), identifies Issues that affect each of these Elements and presents strategies to address these Issues. The *Cultural Resource Management Plan* is divided into 11 Element Chapters: (1) Cultural Resource Planning; (2) Archaeology; (3) Civil War Sites; (4) Artifacts and Collections; (5) Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects and Traditional Cultural Properties; (6) Fairfax County Historic Overlay Districts; (7) Listings; (8) Cemeteries; (9) Cultural Landscapes; (10) Human Impact on Cultural Resources; and (11) Stewardship Education. The Elements are major areas that the Park Authority has to address in the management and protection of cultural resources. The purpose of the Plan is to develop or formalize methodologies for the identification, evaluation, management, protection, treatment and interpretation of cultural resources.

Background

As the county continues to develop and the number of threatened cultural resources available for identification dwindles, planning is critical to protect and preserve them. In order to protect and mitigate any adverse effects, cultural resource planning must be addressed early in the development review and park development processes.

Cultural resources in the county include prehistoric and historical archaeological sites; historic buildings, structures, objects and districts; Civil War sites; cemeteries and cultural landscapes. More than 3,000 Fairfax County archaeological sites have been registered with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources that serves as the State Historic Preservation Office for the Commonwealth of Virginia. In addition, 1,000 more sites have been recorded, including archaeological sites, cemeteries and architectural resources that need additional survey. More than 870 sites have been identified on Fairfax County parkland; however, only a small percentage of archaeological sites have been subject to a comprehensive survey. Surveys on parkland most often occur on an as-needed basis, through the Development Plan Review process, the Park Master Planning Process, or Capital Improvement Projects. Given many recent acquisitions and limited staffing commitments, only a small fraction of parkland has been surveyed. Currently, there are 39 resources in the county listed in the National Register of Historic Places, seven of which are on parkland. There are some 850 American Civil War sites, documented in the *Civil War Site Inventory*. Currently, the *Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites*, a listing of locally important historic architectural resources in the county, is being updated (as of October 2005, there are 345). More than 3,000,000 artifacts are curated in the county archaeological collections.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section employs volunteers, sponsors the Northern Virginia Chapter of the Archeological Society of Virginia, and works closely with the Fairfax County History Commission, the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and other similar agencies within the county. The Section has a comprehensive archives and library of technical reports, historical background documents, maps, and photographs, ACCESS databases and EXCEL spreadsheets linked to shape files in GIS, and a cooperative data exchange with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources that are used to coordinate cultural resource information.

Issue 1 *Heritage Resource Management Plan*

The *Heritage Resource Management Plan* was written in the mid-1980s and was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1988. The goal of the *Heritage Resource Management Plan* was to present comprehensive research priorities for the county. The Plan was developed based on the first 713 archaeological sites documented with the state when the pace of development was much greater. The *Heritage Resource Management Plan*, which at the time earned the “Outstanding Achievement Award” from the Washington Metropolitan Area Chapter of the American Planning Association, is outdated. It needs

to be revised to bring it in line with current planning guidelines, new technologies, such as GIS, and vast amounts of new cultural resource data available, as well as to be consistent with current federal, state and local guidelines and best practices. In addition, preservation priorities need to be reviewed. Because the *Heritage Resource Management Plan* is part of the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan, any changes would have to be approved by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. Any *Heritage Resource Management Plan* amendments also would need to be a collaborative effort between the Park Authority and the Department of Planning and Zoning.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Coordinate with the Department of Planning and Zoning to review and evaluate the *Heritage Resource Management Plan*. Special consideration should be given to Plan elements, such as the Study Units, to be consistent with currently accepted chronological designations and terminology used by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.
- 1.2 Coordinate with the Heritage Resources element of the County Policy Plan Review to strengthen the ability to analyze new and existing sites, in order to determine treatment plans for all threatened cultural resources; and provide a framework for site-specific Area Plans amendments within the Comprehensive Plan that require updates.

■ Issue 2 Cultural Resource Surveys on Parkland

Conducting cultural resource surveys on parkland is an important part of the park planning process and is done prior to land acquisition and during the Park Master Planning process. Cultural resource surveys allow planners and decision-makers to make informed land acquisition and land-use recommendations and decisions.

Cultural resource surveys currently utilize the following tools and methods:

1. GIS information and historical background documentation.
2. Pedestrian reconnaissance in the form of physical survey of the parcel.
3. Archaeological surveys including the excavation of limited, judgmentally placed shovel test pits, where appropriate. If needed, additional shovel test pits are systematically located at regular intervals on a grid. The area to be tested may be part or all of a parcel. All shovel test pits should be excavated to subsoil.
4. Architectural surveys that document and record all buildings and structures that are more than 50 years in age.
5. Identification of all other data resources to provide information that assures protection or preservation of important resources and provides guidance for resource impact mitigation prior to treatment or destruction.
6. Research findings are documented in a report to be on file with the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section and submitted to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

Land Acquisition

Prior to land acquisition, parcels being considered for purchase should undergo cultural resource review, to allow better assessment of parcels slated for certain uses. Consultation with Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section prior to purchase will help determine use feasibility and/or resource-based uses and/or preservation and protection.

Park Master Planning

The Park Master Planning process for individual parks includes the development of a General Management Plan and a Conceptual Development Plan. The General Management Plan includes a description of existing conditions and identifies generalized activity zones. The Conceptual Development Plan proposes a conceptual development scheme for the site. Sections describing cultural resources and potential effects on cultural resources are included in the Master Plan.

Cultural Resource assessments should be completed, either in-house or by consultants, as needed. GIS information should be reviewed to assess site potential. Historical background research should include a review of historic maps, secondary sources, title searches and other historical research, as needed. Documentation from field and archival/historical research should be reviewed in order to develop existing condition summaries and assess site potential. This information should be used to identify potential impacts and develop protection measures, as needed. Sources of background data include, but are not limited to, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section archives, other Fairfax County archives, the Virginia Room of the Fairfax Regional Library and the Library of Congress.

■ **Strategies**

- 2.1 Develop assessment procedures and guidelines for parcels slated for land acquisition prior to their acquisition. Assess parcels prior to their acquisition and provide results to appropriate Planning and Development staff to inform the decision process.
- 2.2 Assess potential properties slated for park development. Provide Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section with enough lead time on upcoming Park Master Planning projects to allow for preparing necessary cultural resource documentation. Educate the public through these documents.
- 2.3 Include preparation of Cultural Landscape Reports in the Park Master Planning process, where appropriate.
- 2.4 Create criteria and procedures to prioritize cultural resource assessment and inventory projects.

Issue 3 Cultural Resource Surveys for Development Plan Review and Zoning Change Applications

As part of the Development Plan Review process, Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff reviews development plans and zoning change applications. Staff provides support and recommendations, as applicable, based on the individual plans. Staff utilizes GIS to determine previously identified resources and assess site potential by consulting predictive models. Where appropriate, staff conducts field reconnaissance to assess site conditions and archaeological potential. Upon completion of the assessment, staff makes written recommendations to Planning and Development for each plan review. Recommendations may require that an outside cultural resource consultant be used for survey and background research, as needed. When archaeological or architectural projects are recommended, staff reviews reports and prepares documents that address these reports.

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Continue to participate in the development review process county-wide and improve coordination with Department of Planning and Zoning staff for review to streamline the process.
- 3.2 Improve the efficiency of GIS assessment through the fine-tuning of predictive models for archaeological site assessment and development review.

Issue 4 Capital Improvement Projects

Capital Improvement Projects, which are done as part of park development, are usually funded through voter-approved bond referenda. Cultural resource assessments and historic site and structure evaluations are an important part of the capital improvement planning that informs the process and assists in the project definition, interpretation and cost estimation. During the Capital Improvement process, identification and evaluation of cultural resources is key to providing proper support. For instance, at Historic Huntley cultural resource studies included a Historic Structures Report, a Cultural Landscape Report and archaeological investigations. These studies provided the appropriate treatment information and foundation for planning, designing and conducting the stabilization and restoration projects. Proper treatment for these specialized sites allow for greater authenticity in future site interpretation.

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Continue to coordinate with appropriate Park Authority staff in planning and conducting Capital Improvement Projects.
- 4.2 When cultural resource studies are required, either hire limited-term exempt staff to supervise volunteers and interns or hire cultural resource consultants.

- 4.3 Work with volunteers, friends groups and the public to support these projects. The participation brought to projects by Friends' groups can augment staff skills.
- 4.4 Prepare condition assessments of historic structures on a periodic basis to identify capital improvement needs. Identify anticipated date of end of average life span for building components whose replacement would require capital improvement funds, e.g. roofs.

Issue 5 Coordination with Department of Planning and Zoning and Office of Site Development Services staff

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section and the Planning and Development Division work closely with Department of Planning and Zoning and Office Of Site Development Services on development plan review and other issues. These departments need to continue to work together to ensure the consistency of mandating archaeological surveys where needed, in order to limit impacts to cultural resources.

Although the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff reviews plans generated by the Office of Site Development Services, staff cannot mandate that archaeology be conducted when significant sites are threatened as part of Office of Site Development Services cases. Staff can only request either that archaeology be done or that they be allowed to conduct salvage excavation that can result in the loss of information from potentially unique and significant sites.

■ Strategies

- 5.1 Develop a procedure to closely track proffers, which includes review of consultant reports by Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff.
- 5.2 Develop policies to ensure cultural resource protection on "By Right" development.
- 5.3 Coordinate with staff from the Planning and Development Division, the Department of Planning and Zoning and the Office of Site Development Services, as appropriate, to develop county ordinance or Public Facilities Manual amendments to better protect cultural resources.
- 5.4 Ensure that proffer monies include adequate funds for all archaeological and other cultural resources studies to be conducted and ensure that reports generated from these studies are routed to the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section offices at the James Lee Center, where they can be reviewed by Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff in a timely manner.
- 5.5 Coordinate closely with the Department of Planning and Zoning and the Office of Site Development Services to develop a program that will allow for mutual staff education and understanding of respective roles.

Issue 6 Coordination with Other Agencies

Staff in other county agencies and in agencies beyond the county deal with cultural resource planning issues as part of master planning, park development, private development and stewardship education. Coordination with representatives from these agencies allows for the opportunity to share information and support while pursuing common goals.

Strategies

- 6.1 Network with staff from other county agencies and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources on a regular basis.
- 6.2 Develop a regional network of cultural resource professionals working in federal, state and local government agencies in the region and coordinate with them on a regular basis to share information and professional camaraderie on stewardship, education and interpretation.
- 6.3 Coordinate with the Fairfax County History Commission, historical societies, friends' groups, archaeological associations and other agencies to share information.
- 6.4 Strategize with cultural resource professionals from the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Services and other federal agencies, as well as Virginia State Parks and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority to coordinate efforts for resource stewardship, compatible site interpretations and other purposes.
- 6.5 Coordinate closely with historic preservation groups, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Preservation Institute and other federal, regional and local preservation organizations. Regularly participate in the Preservation Roundtable which is sponsored by the National Preservation Institute and provides a forum for historic preservation professionals to share ideas. Coordinate, where appropriate, with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Issue 7 Define and Develop Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section Best Practices

It is the role of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section to define best practices for cultural resource management and protection in Fairfax County. This effort has not been formalized or initiated. Using best practices supports achievement of high quality of resource protection for the citizens of Fairfax County.

Strategies

- 7.1 Review and assess current practices for the management and protection of cultural resources and compare our practices with those of other agencies that deal with cultural resource issues.

- 7.2 Develop best practices for assessing, protecting, restoring, preserving and interpreting our cultural resources and implement these practices.
- 7.3 Review the findings of the Needs Assessment and examine how to address the needs while protecting cultural resources.

Issue 8 Review of Section 106, Section 4(f) and NEPA Documents

During the course of a year, there are numerous federal projects that require cultural resource review. Projects that are conducted on federal lands, receive federal funding, or require federal permits are subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Under Section 106, it is the responsibility of a federal agency to locate and identify and evaluate sites, structures or districts that may be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. If such historic properties are found to be within a project area, they must be subject to mitigation measures, which can either be avoidance or data recovery or documentation. For calendar year 2005, VDHR logged 255 Section 106 projects for Fairfax County. No agency in the County is being notified of all Section 106 projects. The Department of Planning and Zoning, the Park Authority, the Fairfax County History Commission, and the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board each get notification of selected projects, but no agency or commission gets notification of all.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) stipulates that when a federal project is being considered, a series of alternatives must be examined to determine which will have the fewest environmental impacts. Such projects address a variety of disciplines, including cultural resources. They identify existing conditions; discuss the various alternatives and their impacts; and, on the basis of looking at a series of components, identify a preferred alternative. During the course of a year, several NEPA projects must be reviewed.

For transportation projects, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, addresses impacts to parklands and historic sites. Under Section 4(f), a study has to demonstrate that

there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using the land; and that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the parkland and historic sites resulting from the use. During the course of the year, several 4(f) projects may be reviewed.

Strategies

- 8.1 Organize a meeting with representatives from the Fairfax County Park Authority, the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Fairfax County History Commission, the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources to discuss who is the responsible party in the County to coordinate Section 106 review.
- 8.2 Coordinate with the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Planning and Development Division of the Park Authority, and other appropriate County or

Park Authority agencies to ensure that the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has the opportunity to comment on NEPA and 4(f) documents.

Plan Element Archaeology

Background

Archaeology is the scientific study of material remains of human culture from the past recovered through excavation. Archaeology includes the study of artifacts, features and soil strata that contain evidence of past human life and activities. Archaeologists analyze these remains, previous archaeological studies and other documentation, including that from related disciplines, to better understand past cultures.

Archaeology allows the Fairfax County Park Authority to document significant segments of Native American and post contact history of the county. The majority of what is known about Native American culture prior to the arrival of Europeans is based upon archaeological and ethnographic data. After the time of European settlement, most written history was comprised of documentation of people who were politically or socially well-placed or documentation of major political events. Native Americans, freed and enslaved Africans, indentured servants, women, children, and the lower classes have been poorly documented by traditional history. Many of these people did not leave their own written records and only appear in records that others wrote about them. Additionally, most people in the past did not describe their day-to-day life. Thus, it is not well-understood. In many cases the sole documentation of certain people or groups from the past is from the archaeological record. Archaeology allows us to more fully understand the history of Fairfax County and has allowed us to fill in many gaps in our knowledge.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section of the Fairfax County Park Authority conducts archaeology and cultural resource studies both on parkland and elsewhere in the county. As such, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section is the primary steward of archaeological resources in the entire county.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has inventoried thousands of Native American and historical archaeological sites in the county. More than 3000 sites have been registered with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (the State Historic Preservation Office) and another 1000+ archaeological, architectural and funerary sites which are of county significance have been documented. Fairfax County contains a number of sites that are either eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The use of archaeology and other related fields can provide significant information for the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section to determine relative significance of sites based on their integrity, presence of temporally and functionally diagnostic artifacts and other important factors. Referencing these characteristics, the Park Authority can provide up-to-date information for other county agencies when development is planned for a specific parcel. The totality of information, including sites that no longer exist and those significant for record-keeping purposes provides a unique historic record used by the Park Authority to interpret the county's rich cultural heritage.

The location of archaeological sites is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act because of their sensitivity and to protect them from vandals and relic hunters. In order to protect them, the specific location of archaeological sites will not be depicted on general distribution maps.

Cultural Resource management and protection within the county is mandated by County and Park Authority policies. Policies that refer to treatment of Cultural Resources (including archaeology) may be found in the Fairfax County Park Authority Policy Manual and the “Cultural Resource Protection Policies” (*Policy Plan*, Heritage Resources, Objective 3, p. 4). The Fairfax County Park Authority Policy Manual Objectives include:

- *“Policy 200: Protect and preserve significant and sensitive natural and cultural resources in accordance with adopted criteria and standards and adherence with natural and heritage resource management guidelines and Countywide Policy Plan obligations so that these resources may be handed on to future generations”*

Policy 203 describes the policy for the treatment of Cultural Resources on parkland and Policy 204 addresses the Park Authority’s responsibility for archaeology county-wide. (Text of these policies can be found in the Appendices.)

The “Cultural Resource Protection Policies” (*Policy Plan*, Heritage Resources, Objective 3, p. 4) were designed to protect significant heritage (cultural) resources from degradation, or damage and destruction by public or private action. The goal is to:

Policy a. Avoid adverse impacts on or destruction of significant heritage resources unless there is no prudent and feasible alternative, in which case, plan and carry out appropriate mitigation activities to minimize the adverse effect; and,

Policy b. Plan and undertake appropriate actions to retain and enhance significant heritage resources to be affected by public or private land use or development.

These policies specifically refer to treatment of archaeology and cultural resources in the Park Authority and in the county. In addition, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section follows the standards and guidelines set forth by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the National Park Service. (Full text of the County Policies and reference to state and federal policies can be found in the appendices. Web addresses for other pertinent regulations also can be found in the appendices.)

Issue 1 Geographic Information System (GIS) Assessment

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section updates and analyzes its archaeological site files utilizing the county’s GIS technology. Polygon shape files of

site locations, integrated with multiple data sets, have allowed the Park Authority archaeologists to manage cultural resources with cutting-edge technology. Individual data sets include information specific to historic sites, Native American sites, Civil War sites, as well as an independent data set that merges site photographs and current site conditions. Through GIS, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has access to both topographic maps and many other data layers as well as aerial photography, thereby allowing the user to analyze the topography of the property and existing conditions. Analysis of this combination of variables allows staff to complete quick cultural resource assessments for specific properties throughout the county. These assessments allow for the determination of the amount of disturbance that a particular property has undergone to show if a particular area contains an existing recorded site or sites, and to predict potential for sites, using predictive models for site location, based on topography, geology, hydrology, soil types and proximity to other sites in the vicinity. The Park Authority is in the process of digitizing the negatives for historic aerial photographs of the county from the National Archives and Records Administration for the years 1937, 1943, and 1954. Analysis of early aerial photographs can allow the archaeologist to identify and analyze buildings or anomalies in order to target specific areas for survey, thereby helping to save costs on comprehensive surveys.

For archaeological resources, accurate locational data is key to the success in learning about past building traditions, settlement patterns and past lifeways. Identifying and following trends on the landscape requires that resources are located on the ground. In addition, for management and physical preservation of these resources, it is important to know the environmental and human influences that might pose any adverse effects to specific resources. Locational data associated with features, combined with the power of GIS to integrate different data sources, allows preservationists to take advantage of these technologies in planning and researching cultural resources.

The Fairfax County Cultural Resource GIS project is linked to four separate databases. The first set is related to historical archaeological sites and their attributes. This database consists of chronological data, historic contexts, artifact types, county register numbers (for historic houses in the county) and other information. A second set contains prehistoric site information including diagnostic artifacts, lithic material types, integrity of sites, cultural affiliation and site type. Both of these data sets were created several years ago by archaeologists from Fairfax County.

The Park Authority has developed two additional data sets that provide additional data to the shape files. The third data set is the Archaeological Site Data Management set. This consists of a number of data, including site photographs, parcel numbers, detailed information on the park itself, integrity of the sites, types of disturbances, encroachments and other data that relate to park property. This particular data set was then linked to the shape files. The fourth data set was created as a result of a project to document Civil War sites in the county. It is a separate data set from the others due to the fact that it is a stand-alone Civil War project that provides additional data, including hyperlinked text files, that has been linked to the overall archaeological data. The resulting data set allows

the GIS user quick access to locational data, as well as affiliation, dates of actions and site photographs.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has digitized a three-dimensional view of the county for use as a predictive model for selective surveys of areas within a specified parcel that is undergoing development. While a model can be useful in predicting site location, it is only a model, and further testing will be required. These selected, high potential areas are tested along with moderate and low potential areas in order to determine the accuracy of the model. The current model portrays the county as a three-dimensional image with existing sites. GIS projects that provide cultural resource data include the following data sets: Native American Sites; Historical Archaeological Sites; Architectural Sites; 1860 Land Ownership Map; Civil War Sites Inventory; Mills and Cemeteries.

GIS can make archaeological survey and documentation a more efficient and useful process in which archaeologists and planners can work together with other cultural resource managers. The methods that are used can proactively affect the preservation of sites and enhance the ability of cultural resource managers to understand and manage their resources. In the future, these technologies will play an increasingly critical role in capturing cultural resource data, maintaining that data, managing the resources themselves, and planning for the proper treatment of these resources. In addition, GIS becomes a powerful component not only during the initial planning of surveys, but in the interpretation of the sites themselves and the relationship between sites. It should be noted that the use of GIS technology cannot be used in place of field verification; rather, GIS is best utilized as a predictive tool that allows archaeologists to make early planning decisions. Predictions made using GIS must be verified through archaeological fieldwork.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Update existing GIS files. Every new site found in the county should immediately be placed in the appropriate shape file. Data associated with these shapes should be placed in linked databases.
- 1.2 Train all Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff so they can access and create maps using existing GIS data. Cultural Resource personnel must be continually trained on software updates as they become available.
- 1.3 Complete digitizing the historic aerial photographs of Fairfax County (1937, 1943 and 1954) from National Archives and integrate images into GIS shape files to allow more accuracy in predicting site locations, as these early views of the county can allow the user to envision the county as it was in the early part of county history.
- 1.4 Explore funding to geo-reference historic aerial photographs as a layer in GIS. Geo-referencing refers to placing markers into the shape file that can be recognized by the GIS project. This allows the historic aerial photographs to be linked precisely to other shape files that exist in the county database.

- 1.5 Establish additional links between GIS shape files and historic photos and/or documents.

Issue 2 Survey and National Register Evaluation

The goal of a Phase I archaeological survey is to locate and identify archaeological sites, thus establishing the presence or absence of archaeological sites. Prior to any fieldwork, historical background research must be conducted to develop a historic context for the site. Archaeological survey can be conducted utilizing a number of means including a pedestrian reconnaissance; surface examination of erosional zones; excavation of systematically placed shovel test pits; and the use of a backhoe to remove pavement or fill that might overlie intact archaeological surfaces. The excavation of shovel test pits allows for the excavation and documentation of sediments in order to recover artifacts or find features related to human occupation. Shovel test pits measure some 50 centimeters in diameter (as per the modified VDHR guidelines) , and should be excavated to culturally sterile subsoil (sediments that were deposited prior to any possible human occupation).

An archaeological survey of a property allows the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section to better understand and document who lived there in the past. The survey of a property allows for the compilation of a reasonably accurate inventory of sites. This information allows for informed management decisions, as well as providing for additional data in order to reveal the broader patterns of past human relationships to the Fairfax County landscape.

The goal of Phase II archaeological testing is to:

- determine site integrity (e.g. to ascertain whether a site is intact or disturbed),
- establish site boundaries (e.g. determine the vertical and horizontal extent of the site),
- establish cultural affiliation (e.g. what group or groups used the site during the time it was occupied), and
- assess the site as to its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

In the assessment of archaeological sites, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff uses two broad criteria: National Register criteria and “public significance”.

National Register criteria for evaluation include:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- a. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- b. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- c. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*
- d. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

Most archaeological sites are eligible under Criterion d. (For additional information, see the Listing Element).

Sites that do not meet the eligibility criteria for the National Register of Historic Places, but that are of considerable interest and concern to county residents, are considered to have “public significance.” The *Heritage Resource Management Plan* states:

It is therefore important to evaluate county resources, especially those that don’t meet the criteria for National Register eligibility, from the viewpoint of public values. For example, a remnant of a Civil War earthwork that has been subjected to relic-hunter activity retains little archaeological integrity and would probably not meet National Register criteria. The local community, however, may care very strongly for its “own piece of history”.

These sites, too, should be considered to have importance.

The significance of a site is evaluated in relation to its historic context. Evaluation of archaeological sites allows staff to assess sites as to their importance. This assists in the park planning process, in resource protection, in cultural resource management and in site interpretation. However, because parkland is only a small fraction of the 399 square miles of Fairfax County, human behavior and activities must be based on findings from the entire county. The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has been assigned by the Board of Supervisors the mission of survey, evaluation and recommendations for cultural resources throughout the county.

Strategies

- 2.1 Establish a long-range program for the archaeological survey of parkland.
- 2.2 Request that funding for archaeological survey and evaluation be included in future bond funding requests. Consider hiring additional staff or using consultants to achieve survey and evaluation goals.
- 2.3 Prioritize known sites on Park Authority lands that should be evaluated and begin a program for their evaluation.

- 2.4 Conduct necessary archaeological surveys and evaluate those resources. Make appropriate recommendations and maintain complete data sets for the county's cultural resources.
- 2.5 Set up partnerships and internships with universities, societies and agencies and continue to use volunteers to assist in the survey and evaluation of sites on parkland.
- 2.6 Compile and keep current a listing of National Register eligible and listed archaeological sites in the county.
- 2.7 Establish guidelines for conducting archaeological survey, testing and data recovery excavations to serve as a guide to county staff and consultants.
- 2.8 When appropriate, apply for National Register listing for qualified sites not on parkland, e.g. sites developers agree to protect in open space

Issue 3 Protection and Treatment

For sites that are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, or for sites that have public significance, a concerted effort should be made to ensure their preservation and protection. Archaeological sites are non-renewable resources. On parkland, all prudent and feasible alternatives should be explored to avoid adverse effects to significant sites. Every effort should be made to protect significant sites from impact. On non-park property, developers should be encouraged to preserve significant sites in open space areas.

In instances where significant sites cannot be avoided, plans for treatment must be undertaken. Treatment can include Phase III archaeological data recovery excavations and public outreach. Prior to the conduct of data recovery excavations, it is paramount that a research design be established to direct the research.

Strategies

- 3.1 Develop Standing Operating Procedures for development of research designs to establish clear and organized mitigation plans for all sites.
- 3.2 Identify data recovery projects where the fieldwork has been conducted by the county, but no technical report has been produced. Establish a year-round program using interns to complete outstanding reports.
- 3.3 Examine other agencies' approaches to site protection and update the Park Authority approach, as necessary.

Issue 4 Interpretation

In general, archaeological sites are not adequately interpreted to the public. Deficiencies are demonstrated by the fact that the discipline is poorly understood by the public. The protection and survival of non-renewable archaeological resources is dependent upon the public becoming involved in resource stewardship. This can only be accomplished by the development of a knowledgeable constituency.

Archaeological resources are important to the county as they are essential components to our common cultural heritage. This heritage can bring all of the ethnic groups together. Archaeological resources are preserved or excavated in order to interpret the data for the public as well as the scientific community. This interpretation of our common cultural heritage is a fundamental mission of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section.

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Encourage the dissemination of study results to the public through posters, public reports, brochures, web pages; local news shows and presentations to school children, senior citizens and the general public, as well as professional audiences. Exhibits should be prepared to be displayed at county offices, libraries, recreation centers, golf courses and other public buildings.
- 4.2 Encourage public visitation to archaeological sites by school children, senior citizens and the general public. Selected field projects on parkland should have a public involvement component to publicize the value of the archaeology to our common cultural heritage.
- 4.3 Recruit volunteers to assist with the interpretation of archaeological resources as part of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section volunteer program.
- 4.4 Develop a program that embraces individual ethnic groups by providing multi-lingual public outreach programs. These can convey the county's heritage to all of its population by including all of its members.
- 4.5 Continue to work with the on-line museum and examine the possibility of a county museum.
- 4.6 Establish an archaeology camp for children to get them interested in the stewardship of cultural resources at an early age.
- 4.7 Develop a school field-trip program to archaeology sites.

Background

The Fairfax County Park Authority has a number of known Civil War sites on parkland. These include: Ox Hill Battlefield, Confederate Fortifications Historic Site (Union Mills), Mount Eagle, Freedom Hill Fort, Fort Willard, Sully Historic Site, Frying Pan Meeting House, Mt. Gilead, Lake Accotinck Park, Wakefield Park, Manassas Gap Railroad, and the Centreville Military Railroad. These parks are treasured resources from the Civil War period and should be preserved and protected. They also provide a great opportunity to educate the public on the importance of Civil War history in Fairfax County.

Fairfax County's Civil War experience was a function of its strategic location within Confederate Virginia, but adjacent to the national capital in Washington, D.C. Railroads and turnpikes that were critical for moving troops passed through the county, and the outer forts built to protect Washington were located along the boundary between Federally occupied Alexandria and Fairfax County. Although massive battles were not fought in the county, important military actions were fought around Manassas/Bull Run, Ox Hill and Dranesville. Major encampments occupied the county, especially around Centreville, and numerous armed engagements were fought to control transportation corridors. Campaigns directed at Richmond and Washington surged through Fairfax County, affecting nearly every part of the county.

Because of the proximity of Fairfax County to Washington, D.C., it was the location of much activity by both Federal (Union) and Confederate troops. Each side believed that a stronghold in the county was in their favor for either offensive or defensive reasons. Both Federal and Confederate troops spent considerable time encamped within the county and marching through the county.

Manassas Junction was a key to the Confederate defense of northern Virginia. Its strategic value for defense lay in the junction of the Orange & Alexandria Railroad and the Manassas Gap Railroad. Extensive earthworks were erected near Centreville to protect Manassas Junction.

On April 17, 1861, the Virginia General Assembly passed the Ordinance of Secession. By May of 1861, Confederate troops were amassed at Manassas Junction while Federal troops occupied Arlington Heights and the City of Alexandria. In the following weeks, citizens of Fairfax County found themselves confronted with the uncertainty, fear, and excitement of war at their doorsteps. Fearing for the safety of their families, many citizens fled the region. Trapped between the opposing armies, farmers were unable to move their produce to markets. The area between the Federal forts on the outskirts of Alexandria and the Confederate forces assembling near Centreville became a no-man's land.

Anticipating a general movement on Manassas by Federal troops under command of Brigadier General Irvin McDowell, Brigadier General P.G.T. Beauregard spent June and the beginning of July preparing the Confederate army for the coming attack. Forced by political pressure for action, President Abraham Lincoln ordered an advance on Manassas Junction. According to General McDowell's plan, the Federal army would move to Fairfax Courthouse and then to Centreville to oppose Confederate forces along Bull Run.

On July 16, the Federal army began its movement on Manassas Junction and advanced through Fairfax Courthouse and occupied Centreville on July 18, 1861. The army marched through Fairfax County on roads such as Little River Turnpike, Chain Bridge Road, and Columbia Turnpike. On the same day that Federal troops arrived in Centreville, 12,000 Confederate soldiers moved to reinforce Manassas from the Shenandoah Valley, leaving Federal General Patterson unaware of their departure.

During the First Battle of Manassas (Bull Run), Confederate reinforcements under the command of General Joseph Johnston traveled by rail over the Manassas Gap Railroad and were a decisive factor in the Confederate victory. This movement by rail was the first time in military history that a railroad was used to achieve strategic mobility (Faust 1986:47).

The Confederate victory at First Manassas cost the Confederacy 387 killed, 1,582 wounded, and 13 missing. The Federal rout cost the Federal army 460 killed, 1,124 wounded, and 1,312 missing, most of whom were captured.

From August 1861 through March 1862, Confederate forces occupied Fairfax County. In 1861, the Confederate defensive line, near Centreville, was thought to be impregnable by the Federal troops. The area was an armed camp with more than 32,000 troops supplied by a military railroad specially constructed from Manassas Junction. Meanwhile, the Federal troops were erecting a series of earthen fortifications for the defenses of Washington. These included forts, lunettes, redoubts and batteries, and fortified picket posts.

At least sixty-one small-scale demonstrations of force took place within Fairfax County during the fall and winter of 1861, at places like Pohick Church, Great Falls, Centreville, Bailey's Cross Roads, Little River Turnpike, Springfield Station, and Munson's Hill. One notable engagement took place at Dranesville on December 20, 1861, where Federal and Confederate foraging parties clashed. Brigadier General J.E.B. Stuart, with 150 cavalymen, 4 infantry regiments and an artillery battery, accompanied a foraging expedition as an escort. Brigadier General E.O.C. Ord, commanding the Federal forces, had been ordered to confiscate forage from local farmers. After a sharp fight, Stuart ordered a withdrawal of troops after making certain his wagons were safe. Stuart suffered 230 casualties and Ord lost 71 (Faust 1986:226). Stuart's withdrawal and the loss of so many men in a foraging expedition pointed to a Federal victory in this engagement.

In March 1862, the Confederates withdrew behind the Rappahannock River. Since the Confederates had moved out, the Federal troops were largely unopposed in Fairfax County. The Union Army of the Potomac moved via transport ships to the Virginia Peninsula and tried to capture Richmond, without success. In August of 1862, another Union army, the Army of Virginia, under General Pope, moved west, leaving their rear and supply base at Manassas Junction, unprotected. Stonewall Jackson's troops flanked Pope's army, captured the rail junction and burned Pope's supply trains. Reinforced with elements from McClellan's Army of the Potomac, General Pope ordered a concentration of forces against Jackson's veterans. Located behind an abandoned railroad embankment, the Confederates repulsed six bloody assaults. After a massive counterattack by Major General James Longstreet, the Federal line crumbled. A year and month after the Battle of First Manassas, the Confederate Army won another victory on the banks of Bull Run, which were within one day's march of the hills that overlooked the Capitol (Faust 1986:94-95).

On August 31, after the second Federal defeat at Manassas (Bull Run), Federal troops regrouped on the fortified heights at Centreville. To flank the federal troops from their strong Centreville position, Confederate General Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson moved down Little River Turnpike west of Chantilly. The movement resulted in the September 1, 1862 Battle of Ox Hill (Chantilly). The battle was a vicious clash that occurred in a torrential downpour that added to the confusion of the fight. An understrength division led by Federal Brigadier General Isaac Stevens surprised and attacked the larger Confederate force as they were deploying their battle line. Stevens was supported by Major General Philip Kearny's division. The Battle of Ox Hill (Chantilly) cost Jackson's corps about 800 men, while the Federal troops sustained about 1300 casualties. Neither side gained much advantage but the Union lost two prominent generals, Brigadier General Isaac Stevens and Major General Philip Kearny.

By late 1862 and early 1863, picket posts, railroad guard camps, road junction sentinels, and early-warning lookouts were assigned throughout Fairfax County at Fairfax Station, Fairfax Courthouse, Union Mills, Dranesville, Vienna, and a host of other locations.

John Singleton Mosby and his elusive group conducted guerrilla operations in northern Virginia from January 1863 until the end of the war. His command was strictly disciplined, usually operating with 20 to 80 men who quickly dispersed when overpowered. He earned a reputation for tearing up Federal railroads and ambushing supply columns. On March 9, 1863, in one of his first major feats as a partisan, he and 29 men rode into Fairfax Courthouse and captured Federal Brigadier General Edwin H. Stoughton at the Truro Rectory. Mosby's activities in northern Virginia were so successful that Lt. General U.S. Grant gave orders to have him and his followers hanged without a trial if they could be captured. During the war, Mosby estimated that he kept at least 30,000 Federal soldiers away from the front (Cooling 1975:148-150; Faust 1986:514).

Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox officially ended the war on April 9, 1865. The war ended in Fairfax the following day, when a skirmish broke out at Arundel's

Tavern that ended in a Confederate retreat to the Occoquan. A group of Mosby's men met Federal cavalry. The exchange was brief. Mosby's men rode for Wolf Run Shoals. Here they avoided the Federal troops guarding the crossing into Prince William County. Mosby's men dispersed. The war was over; some went home, some never surrendered.

Although few decisive battles took place within the county, Fairfax County was the scene of numerous inconclusive engagements, skirmishes and chance encounters between Federal and Confederate troops monitoring the vaguely fixed front. More common than Confederate-Federal contact was the interaction between soldier and civilian, which defined the conflict as it played out in Fairfax County (Harrison 1998:133-163). What can be described as a cruel war of attrition was waged by soldiers on the unfortunate civilian inhabitants of Fairfax County's no-man's-land and its occupied farms and towns. By the war's end, Fairfax County's antebellum rebound had been negated; the county was left agriculturally devastated with its infrastructure mostly destroyed.

Occupation of northern Virginia by both Federal and Confederate troops decimated the region. The area was devoid of trees. Wood was used for construction and to provide heating and cooking fires to the thousands of soldiers encamped in the county. In addition to denuding the landscape of trees, wooden fences and the wood from corduroy roads, as well as wood from dismantled outbuildings was commandeered. Livestock and crops were taken from farms to feed the soldiers. The War had a devastating effect on the county and region.

The withdrawal of troops and dismantling of forts and other defenses began in the summer of 1865, but the basic earthworks remained. Land scarred by trenches and battery emplacements and covered by campsites did not quickly return to fertility.

The Southern Claims Commission was established by the Federal government in 1870. A flood of claims from Fairfax County citizens was received and processed through the end of the century. Recovery would come in the 1890s. Until that time, perseverance, hard work and community spirit reestablished homes, businesses and churches that were devastated by the occupation and Civil War.

Issue 1 Civil War Sites Inventory

In recognition of the importance of the rich Civil War history of the county, the Board of Supervisors funded the development of a Civil War Sites Inventory; that is, a list of Civil War events, locations, and sites within present-day Fairfax County. The purpose of this inventory was to facilitate better management of Fairfax County's Civil War cultural resources and to inform decisions about preservation planning and development. The Inventory, while not yet completed, represents the first step in identifying the County's Civil War sites. Thus far, 850 sites have been identified. This does not represent a comprehensive accounting of all Civil War sites in the county. The Inventory ranked

sites as primary (exists today), secondary (existed, but was destroyed), and tertiary (anecdotal site).

Two versions of the final report were produced: one for the use of cultural resource professionals and a second for public dissemination. The public version of the report excludes the precise location of Civil War sites, which are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act in order to protect them from relic hunters.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Field check previously identified sites to determine whether they still exist and document their condition periodically.
- 1.2 Document “secondary sites” (those locations where sites were lost to development, but the location is still known, (as defined in the Civil War Sites Inventory)) on a regular basis.

Issue 2 Additional Civil War Site Identification, Evaluation, Protection and Treatment.

A need exists for additional identification, evaluation, protection and treatment of Civil War sites. The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has a mandate to study, protect and treat Civil War resources both on parkland and county-wide. Because of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Office of Comprehensive Planning from 1996, the Park Authority has the responsibility, not only for cultural resources in parks, but on non-parkland, as well.

Every effort should be made to continue to expand the Civil War Sites Inventory. This can be accomplished both by updating the archaeological site files and the GIS layer developed for Civil War sites when sites are discovered as part of projects, and by formally continuing a systematic inventory of Civil War Sites.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Continue to add to the Civil War Sites Inventory to allow for protection and treatment of Civil War sites. New sites identified as part of the Development Review process should be added to the inventory.
- 2.2 Explore sources of additional funding to expand and add data to the Civil War Sites Inventory.
- 2.3 Identify endangered sites and resources; document, recommend and implement protection and preservation for the endangered sites.
- 2.4 Acquire important Civil War sites through the land acquisition process. Develop methodology to target specific sites.
- 2.5 Develop and implement standards for the management, protection, preservation, treatment, and interpretation of Civil War sites. Identify which sites have potential for interpretation and visitation and which sites should have restricted

- visitation to preserve cultural resources. Prioritize sites that should be slated for treatment plans.
- 2.6 Identify and evaluate Civil War sites on Park Authority lands. Prioritize Park Authority Civil War resources for protection and treatment.
 - 2.7 Explore the possibility of applying conservation easements to Civil War sites. Partner with other public and private sector agencies and organizations (e.g. Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, Bull Run Civil War Roundtable, Chantilly Battlefield Association, Civil War Trails, etc.) in order to establish protective easements for Civil War Sites that the Park Authority does not own.
 - 2.8 Provide training to maintenance staff for protection and preservation techniques.
 - 2.9 Develop treatment plans for sensitive Civil War sites, including the Centreville Military Railroad (as this was the world's first military railroad) and Fort Willard.

Issue 3 Use of GIS

The Fairfax County Cultural Resources group updates and analyzes the Civil War Sites Inventory GIS layer, when sites are discovered as part of the Master Planning process, Capital Improvement Projects, and other cultural resource studies. As new information is gathered, this will be added to the GIS database and information about each site will be linked to the GIS shape file.

■ Strategy

- 3.1 Update existing GIS files. Every new site that is found in the county should be immediately placed in the appropriate shape file. Data behind these shapes is placed in the linked databases.

Issue 4 Interpretation

As the steward of Civil War resources, it is paramount that we interpret these resources to the public. This allows the public to learn about county history and to enjoy and take an interest in protection of these resources to preserve them for future generations.

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Prepare brochures interpreting the Civil War in the county with time lines and locations of events. Print the brochure and post it on the Park Authority's ResOURces Online website.
- 4.2 Expand the Cultural Resource section on the ResOURces Online website to include Civil War information.
- 4.3 Prepare Civil War exhibits for display in various county public centers, such as libraries, schools and other places with public access.
- 4.4 Coordinate with other agencies (such as the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, State Parks and National Park Service) and jurisdictions (such as Alexandria and Prince William County) for regional Civil War interpretation.

- Work cooperatively to develop multi-jurisdiction events and mutually advertise each other's upcoming events.
- 4.5 Prepare educational lectures or presentations for the public and school groups.
 - 4.6 Incorporate important Fairfax County Civil War sites into the Civil War Trails network as a framework for interpretation.
 - 4.7 Explore the possibility of establishment of a Civil War or archaeological museum for Fairfax County.

Issue 5 Freedom of Information Act Exemption

Civil War sites are frequently damaged or destroyed by recreational ground-disturbing activities and artifact collecting. To protect these resources from willful damage, site-location information is restricted to designated Fairfax County personnel and to other land-use specialists or researchers only as authorized by the Fairfax County Park Authority. These products include the Civil War Sites Inventory; data tables created from, or in support of, the inventory; the GIS site location map layer; maps created showing that layer; Virginia Department of Historic Resources archaeological site forms; Fairfax County Archaeological Site Management Data Forms; and photographs of archaeological sites.

Restriction of site-location information is authorized by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, 2.2-3705. Subsection 36 of the act exempts the public body responsible for records containing information on the specific site location of significant historic and archaeological sites from disclosing such information if disclosure would jeopardize the continued existence of these significant historic and archaeological sites.

■ Strategy

- 5.1 Inform the public about the Freedom of Information Act-Exempt nature of the location of sensitive Civil War sites.

Issue 6 Categorization and Prioritization

Civil War Sites that are currently in the Civil War Sites Inventory and those to be added should be categorized and prioritized in order of importance. The original Civil War Sites Inventory was set up to identify existing sites, destroyed sites and sites where activities were alleged to have occurred. It is of major importance to protect those sites that still exist and to preserve the history associated with sites that have been destroyed. Ranking should include elements derived from the criteria developed by the Civil War Sites Inventory. Sites can be evaluated using these criteria, as primary (sites that still exist; secondary (sites that once existed, but are now destroyed) and tertiary (sites with anecdotal evidence).

■ Strategies

- 6.1 Develop criteria for the ranking of Civil War sites based upon importance and integrity. Use archaeological site criteria for protection of sites. After further evaluation, sites can be documented as events, actions, or simply as anecdotal sites.
- 6.2 Define the type of site as an earthwork, structure or an archaeological site. Employ preservation and protection methods and treatments based on site type.

Issue 7 Protection

Relic hunting on Civil War sites destroys non-renewable resources that are part of the legacy for future generations in the county. The taking of historic or prehistoric artifacts from beneath or above the ground or disturbing the ground for the purpose of locating artifacts or using or possessing a metal or mineral detector on park property is illegal. (Section 15.1-1232 (q) Code of Virginia).^{*} There is a need to discourage relic hunting in order to protect Civil War (and other) sites.

^{*} Title 15.1 of the Code of Virginia was recodified and renumbered effective December 1, 1997.

Strategy

- 7.1 Reactivate previously designed programs. Modernize and reprint “Don’t Pocket the Past” posters to make the public aware that relic hunting on parkland is illegal. Involve the public with the “CAPP Program (Cultural Artifact Protection Program)”. Educate the public on the importance of leaving artifacts and features *in situ* (undisturbed context of artifacts or features).
- 7.2 Work with other park professionals to relocate recreational activities in order to protect Civil War sites from damage.
- 7.4 Continue the dialogue with relic hunters which was initiated as part of the Civil War Sites Inventory. Educate relic hunters as to the importance of context in reference to artifacts.

Background

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section collects, preserves and interprets three dimensional objects, artifacts, and data related to the artifacts. An artifact is defined as any object made, modified or used by people. Another term used for artifacts is “material culture”. Archaeological Collections differ from Museum Collections in a number of ways. Archaeological Collections are usually comprised of artifacts acquired as the result of archaeological excavation; only a small number are the result of donation. Management and care of these objects follows the State Curation Standards as defined by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, rather than by American Association of Museum standards which govern museum collections. The Artifacts and Collections Element addresses only archaeological artifacts and collections. Museum Collections are managed by the Historic Collections Section of the Park Authority. The care and treatment of museum collections in the Park Authority is mandated by Policy 206. All aspects of the documentation and care of museum collections follow the best practices for the Museum field. *Provenance* (ownership history) is important for museum objects, whereas *provenience* (where it is found) is important for artifacts. In contrast to museum objects, only a small percentage of artifacts are exhibited and the majority of artifacts has no monetary value and is temporally diagnostic in nature.

Artifacts are important in interpreting the past only in relationship to the context in which they were found. Therefore, it is imperative that the context information follows the artifact from the field to storage. At the beginning of an archaeological study, a grid system is established across the site to accurately map where excavations are located and artifacts are found. All excavations (shovel test pits or excavation units) are given a unique number or “address” relating to the grid. Field notes are recorded for each excavation describing soil conditions and artifacts, to interpret what is found. When artifacts are recovered from a context, they are bagged together according to where they are found both horizontally and vertically (provenience). This way, archaeologists know the exact location where artifacts were found on a site. Artifacts are then deposited in bags that have been labeled with the provenience information.

Artifact Collections

Collections are acquired as a result of archaeological projects conducted either through the efforts of the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff and volunteers or by consultant archaeologists, hired by developers to fulfill archaeological studies mandated by proffer conditions for rezoning. Material culture is accepted into the collection only with proper documentation, including the excavation records. Almost all the objects in the collection are from Fairfax County. Most of the small number of objects/collections that are from outside the geographic boundaries of the county are from adjacent counties and serve as comparative examples for understanding larger issues in the culture area. The staff also maintains a Type Collection of unprovenienced artifacts that lab staff can use for comparative purposes to help identify artifacts.

The meaning of the term preservation, for this purpose, is expanded to encompass organization of the collection and the ancillary information. When artifacts are brought in from the field they are assigned a discrete Accession Number from the survey, excavation or transfer of material to the collection. An accession number consists of a two number designation for the calendar year and a three number designation for the accession that is sequential. For example, the third accession received in the year 2005 would be indicated as 05 – 003. After cleaning, labeling and inventory, the collection is bagged by provenience and stored in acid-free boxes or other conservation standard acid free boxes in numerical order by its accession number.

Artifacts are brought in from the field and washed. Artifacts from a location (provenience) are bagged together and are catalogued according to this provenience. Artifacts are washed, labeled with a catalogue number that describes where it was found, and described according to material and manufacture. The catalogue information is recorded on a form and the information is entered into an ACCESS database. Objects are stored in plastic bags, placed in boxes and stored in the archaeological collections facility. Field notes from the site are stored with the artifacts.

The archives contain the written information about the collection and cultural resources that may be known, but have not yet been subject to systematic study. This includes documents, maps, and technical reports. Paper files and bound volumes are located in the archives/library. Computer supported files, such as GIS layers, are resident on the county server. The reports are organized by Tax Map squares. Photographs and slides are housed separately. The park files are organized alphabetically by the name of the park. These files contain notes, memoranda, plans, and correspondence relating to the park.

Interpretation

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section is not equipped with a dedicated exhibit space, other than a small exhibit case at James Lee Center. Although not a high traffic area during the day, the case is located in the lobby in front of the 250 seat theater and generates visitation before and after performances.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has designed, prepared and installed table top exhibits in county buildings and in the Board of Supervisors' Offices. Exhibit space is assigned to this section on the first floor of the Government Center, just outside the entrance to the Board of Supervisors Auditorium. Exhibits are designed, prepared and installed by this section, showcasing Cultural Resources in Fairfax County.

Issue 1 Storage Space

The most pressing Collections issue is space to house the growing collection of ca. 3 million artifacts. As part of the rehabilitation of the James Lee School and the creation of the James Lee Community Center, a compactor storage system was installed in the basement. When the rehabilitation was planned the section had the collection in ca. 950 artifact boxes. By the time the rehabilitation of the building was completed, the collection

had grown to about 1,100 boxes. This increase was due to the completion of several large field projects with very high artifact yields and the integration of the collection that had previously been housed at the Park Authority Lewinsville House facility (ca 170,000 + items). Rather than having growth space through at least 2010, the storage at James Lee will be completely filled in 2006.

There are about 40 accessions of non-Fairfax County material. Many of these are from bordering counties of Prince William, Loudoun and Arlington, and they provide comparative material from the same culture area. A space-saving approach would be to deaccession some classes of artifacts from the collection. This action will have to be carefully considered because sometimes the value of certain artifact classes is not evident until much later. For example, in the late nineteenth century, debitage (chipping debris – flakes and chips – resulting from stone tool manufacture) was routinely discarded. Its value was only recognized later. Some collections facilities have chosen to discard fire cracked rock because it had provided limited information to date. A recent study by the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section may refute the argument to discard it.

The newly rehabilitated collection storage space and furniture in the James Lee Center are excellent. However, the building lacks climate control in the collections area. As a consequence, one of the three most important criteria for collections is not being met. The other two, lack of adequate space and security have been addressed.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Study current collections policy and determine if certain classes of materials should be documented and discarded, rather than stored. Modify collections policy, as appropriate.
- 1.2 Acquire additional new compactor units to accommodate about 250 additional boxes. This would provide some much needed growth space.
- 1.3 Explore deaccessioning as a means to promote “larger” curation.
- 1.4 Deaccession artifact collections that are not from Fairfax County.
- 1.5 Assess what would be required to have the artifact storage area climate controlled. Upon obtaining an estimate, examine the possibility of grant funding.

Issue 2 Consolidation of Collections

The Park Authority Cultural Resource Protection Group and County Archaeological Services, formerly managed as separate entities within the Resource Stewardship Branch, were consolidated in February 2003 and moved into the newly renovated James Lee Center in May 2004. Although the move and initial consolidation were successfully completed, there are still two sets of files and collections representing more than 27 years of work that need to be consolidated. This is a time consuming and labor-intensive proposition.

In addition, the archaeological collections are currently catalogued using an ACCESS database system. Several years ago, the Resource Management Division employed ReDiscovery with the idea that both Museum Collections and Archaeological Collections would use this software. More than 3 million artifacts have been catalogued already using earlier databases (Dbase) that were transferred into ACCESS. Since we have this Collections' Management tool available to us, it should be employed.

■ Strategy

- 2.1 Seek grant funding to hire a temporary staff person(s) or a consultant to assist in the consolidation of the collections and associated notes and files.
- 2.2 Transfer more than 3 million archaeological cataloging forms to ReDiscovery software.

Issue 3 Staffing

Collections Management is a very time-consuming endeavor. In the past, the Cultural Resource Protection Group and County Archaeological Services each had a staff position responsible for Collections/Data Management. Due to a realignment of the Section and staffing changes, these Collections/Data Management positions were eliminated. At present, many important collections management functions are not being conducted because of the lack of staff to conduct the work. In order to most expediently improve the efficiency of archaeological collections management, additional staffing is required. Functions that remain largely undone include the reboxing of old collections, the examination of certain materials in the collections to determine if they could be stored elsewhere, and the monitoring of metal objects to determine if they remain stable. In addition, the transfer of the archaeological collections to the ReDiscovery software is impossible without a long-term committed laboratory staff person. Other areas such as the development of exhibits, brochures and interpretative information can only be minimally addressed by a staff that is overextended. In fact, all aspects of collections management, including the care of site files and other documentation, would benefit from the presence of a collections manager.

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Request that a full-time permanent position for a laboratory supervisor at the Heritage Resource Specialist II level be created to conduct all laboratory activities. The transfer to ReDiscovery can be done only with additional staff.

Issue 4 Documentation

Historical documentation is gathered when working on specific projects, whether for an archaeological investigation, historic structure report, cultural landscape report, interpretive plan, land development study, or in preparation of an event. Documentation

includes, but is not limited to reports, photos, oral histories, HABS survey forms, chain of titles, and maps. Copies of such documentation for archaeological sites and other selected cultural resource projects are curated at the James Lee Center.

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Submit copies of cultural resource reports to the Fairfax County Regional Library, Virginia Room and to VDHR for their libraries.
- 4.2 Provide scanned copies of selected photographs to the Fairfax County Regional Library, Virginia Room and the Historic Collections Section.

Issue 5 Exhibit and Display

Only a small fraction of the archaeological artifacts in the collections at James Lee are exhibited. Although the majority of the artifacts are not museum quality, it is important to set up exhibits to show the public that the value of the artifacts is not just being intact, but what meaning artifacts transmit. Since there is not a County Museum, it is imperative to look for other opportunities for display and exhibit.

■ Strategies

- 5.1 Continue to partner with the Historic Collections Section of the Park Authority, the Fairfax Regional Library, Fairfax City and other agencies to develop an on-line museum. Look for grant funding and money from other sources.
- 5.2 Develop a prioritized list of potential locations for exhibits and subjects for exhibits. Set a schedule for the installation of such exhibits.
- 5.3 Continue to work with Fairfax City to develop joint exhibits.

Plan Element Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects and Traditional Cultural Properties

Background

Cultural Resources that fall under the jurisdiction of the Park Authority include buildings, structures, objects and traditional cultural properties that are important in history, architecture, engineering or culture.

Issue 1 Survey

The goal of a survey is to inventory all buildings, structures, objects and/or traditional cultural properties in a given area. Such a survey allows for the identification of these resources and provides the opportunity to monitor these resources. Survey should result in the recording of newly discovered historic buildings, structures, objects and traditional cultural properties on the GIS layers designed for this purpose. Additionally, those properties that meet the criteria should be nominated for inclusion in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites. The Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Zoning is currently updating the Inventory. The Inventory represents both a listing of properties and an assessment of local significance.

Strategies

- 1.1 Coordinate with the Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Zoning to ensure that the guidelines for architectural survey are posted on the county website with links to the Park Authority website.
- 1.2 Ensure that all objects in the county are identified. To date, known objects include the District of Columbia Boundary markers, the Centreville Marker, Willoughby Newton Boundary Stone, and the markers at Ox Hill Battlefield Park. Every effort should be made to inventory any other objects that may exist in the county.
- 1.3 Initiate a program to survey historic buildings, structures, objects, and traditional cultural properties on parkland.
- 1.4 Ensure that the location of all historic buildings, structures, objects, districts and traditional cultural properties are mapped in GIS and are hyperlinked to databases containing information about these resources. Specify whether the resources are listed in the Fairfax County Inventory, the Virginia Landmarks Registry or the National Register. Make a separate layer for architectural resources.

Issue 2 Evaluation

A building, structure, or object can be considered significant at the county, state or federal level. Properties can be listed in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites, the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. The listing process is detailed in the Register Listing Element Chapter. Existing buildings on parkland that are listed in the National Register include Sully, Green Spring and Historic Huntley; Manassas Gap Railroad is listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register. There are

39 sites that are on the National Register of Historic Places. Other resources, however, may not have been evaluated because (1) they are not associated with illustrious people; (2) they were less than 50 years old when the previous survey of an area was conducted; or (3) they dated to the 20th century.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Initiate a program to evaluate buildings, structures, and objects identified on parkland as result of the survey proposed in Strategy 1.3.
- 2.2 Develop a prioritized list of properties that should be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places and begin necessary documentation.

Issue 3 Protection and Treatment

It is the mandate of the Fairfax County Park Authority to manage and protect cultural resources both on parkland and county-wide. The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section supports the Division of Planning of the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and the Fairfax County History Commission regarding the protection of historic buildings, structures, objects and districts county-wide. Fairfax County Park Authority Policy 205 regarding historic restoration states:

Following guidelines established by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines, the Park Authority policy on historic restoration requires that treatment of cultural resources with structural integrity shall be performed according to the following philosophical principles:

- A. *Generally, it is better to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, better to restore than reconstruct.*
- B. *Usually, it is better to retain genuine old work of several periods than to arbitrarily "restore" the whole by new work to its aspect at a single period.*
- C. *Every reasonable care and expense is justified to approximate in new work the materials, methods and quality of old construction.*
- D. *Modern uses should be consistent with the preservation of the building's values.*

In some cases, undertakings have adverse effects on historic structures. In these cases, mitigation measures must be developed. In the case of a visual effect to a structure, the mitigation might include planting to act as a screen or the maintenance of a wooded area as a buffer. In the case of direct effects, mitigation might include recording of a building,

structure or object as per the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record.

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for the care of National Register eligible buildings, structures, and objects.
- 3.2 Develop a prioritized list of buildings and structures that should be subject to Historic Structures Reports. Implement Historic Structures Reports as funding is available.
- 3.3 Establish open-ended contracts for studies of historic buildings, similar to those in place for archaeology and cultural landscape reports.
- 3.4 Ensure that improvements do not endanger historic structures from improper use.
- 3.5 Coordinate with Virginia Department of Historic Resources and Fairfax County Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator to ensure the most appropriate and sensitive application of the Act on historic properties to both provide access and to preserve the integrity of historic properties.
- 3.6 Provide training for appropriate personnel regarding the treatment and maintenance of historic buildings and structures.
- 3.7 Conduct annual facility assessment reports and request funding to perform required maintenance activities. Implement a cyclical maintenance plans for all historic structures.
- 3.8 Work with land acquisition staff to identify properties containing important historic buildings, structures, objects or traditional cultural properties for acquisition. If a property is acquired and requires significant repair or stabilization, limit vandalism, utilize historically accurate materials and methods for treatment and preservation, arrange for police monitoring, and hire appropriately trained contractors.
- 3.9 Work with appropriate county staff and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust to encourage property owners to establish conservation easements on important historic properties.
- 3.10 Explore the possibility of county tax credits for historic properties.
- 3.11 If National Register-eligible buildings, structures or objects are to be subject to adverse effects as a result of construction activities and avoidance is not a feasible alternative, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record documentation should be conducted including the appropriate historical documentation, measured drawings and large format photography.
- 3.12 Establish a program to allow organizations and industries to "Adopt a Historic Building or Structure" program to encourage the community to support the preservation of important historic structures.
- 3.13 Seek and set aside funding for the protection and treatment of historic buildings, structures and objects.

Issue 4 Interpretation

Currently staffed sites such as Sully Historic Site have active interpretation programs that include tours, living history, special programs, exhibits, interpretative brochures and signage. Generally speaking, historic buildings, structures and objects in unstaffed parks are not subject to interpretation. Part of our mandate is to provide educational opportunities for our diverse public about the rich array of history represented by the historic buildings, objects and structures in the county.

Strategies

- 4.1 Develop an interpretive plan template to be implemented for cultural resource interpretation as funding allows.
- 4.2 Elevate public awareness of history through the interpretation of historic buildings, structures, objects and districts in both staffed and unstaffed parks. This should include the preparation of exhibits, interpretative signs, brochures, posters, publications and information available on the Park Authority website. A prioritized list should be made for the development of interpretative materials.
- 4.3 Utilize reconstruction based on historical and archaeological documentation in order to interpret other aspects of historic properties. Limit the use of reconstruction to cases where it is imperative to interpretation. Any reconstruction should be based upon exhaustive historical and archaeological documentation.
- 4.4 Conduct historical research and collect oral histories as a preliminary step in interpretation.
- 4.5 Provide copies of reports, brochures, posters and other promotional material to the Virginia Room of the Fairfax Regional Library and local schools.
- 4.6 Include heritage tourism proposals as a component of Interpretative Plans. Partner with the Visitor's Bureau, Convention Authorities and Economic Development personnel to disperse historical information to attract additional tourism funds.

Issue 5 Traditional Cultural Properties

There are traditions that develop around historic events that have occurred in an area. Although they may be based on anecdotal evidence and are not always fully accurate, they still have value and thus need to be recorded. These resources are called Traditional Cultural properties. A local example of this is Mosby's Rock, where John Singleton Mosby was supposed to have exchanged information with local spies.

Strategy

- 5.1 Record and transcribe oral history accounts that document traditional cultural properties. These tapes and transcriptions should be housed in the Virginia Room of the Fairfax Regional Library and transcriptions should be made available on the website.

Background

The Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning describes Historic Overlay Districts as follows:

Historic Overlay Districts are established when the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors adopts an amendment to the County's Zoning Ordinance. Any citizen, neighborhood organization, or County agency may propose establishing a district, which may consist of a single property or group of related properties. First, recommendations in the form of a research and planning report are prepared by professional staff of the Department of Planning and Zoning. The report is reviewed by the Fairfax County History Commission and Architectural Review Board, then forwarded to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for public hearings and final action.

Historic Overlay Districts usually include more than just the historic "core" and that is why the ARB reviews plans for new development as well as changes to existing properties within the district. This is because historic buildings or sites lose their cultural and aesthetic significance to the citizens of the County -- and economic value to owners -- if inappropriate changes are made to either the building or its environs. Even if the property is owned by a public agency, a private preservation organization, or a sympathetic and knowledgeable private individual, it may be vulnerable if, for example, nearby development blocks a view or poorly designed buildings are constructed next door.

The purpose of establishing a Historic Overlay District is to protect the historic resource and area surrounding it. Historic Overlay Districts have been designated by the Board of Supervisors as having historic, architectural or cultural significance. Zoning Ordinance Article 7, Part 2, 7-201 Purpose and Intent states:

Regulations within such districts are intended to protect against destruction of or encroachment upon such areas, structures, and premises; to encourage uses which will lead to their continuance, conservation, and improvement in a manner appropriate to the preservation of the cultural, social, economic, political, architectural, or archaeological heritage of the County; to prevent creation of environmental influences adverse to such purposes; and to assure that new structures and uses within such districts will be in keeping with the character to be preserved and enhanced.

Historic Overlay Districts function as a county planning tool, because they regulate the type and scope of development in the districts. The Fairfax County Architectural Review

Board reviews development projects proposed for the historic overlay districts and acts in either an advisory capacity or a decision-making capacity dependent upon the application type. As required by the Zoning Ordinance, all applications for rezoning, special exceptions, special permits, variances, sign permits, or other construction permits, as well as all site plans, subdivision plats, and grading plans for properties within Historic Overlay Districts must be submitted to the Architectural Review Board for review. Sign and Building Permits require approval by the Architectural Review Board before their issuance. The Architectural Review Board's recommendations are then forwarded to the appropriate county agencies for their review and implementation.

Historic Overlay Districts in Fairfax County, and the year they were established by the Board of Supervisors, include:

***Bull Run Stone Bridge** - Located on the grounds of Manassas National Battlefield Park, the stone arch bridge over Bull Run was a strategic crossing point during the two major Civil War battles fought nearby. Established 1972*

***Centreville** - This crossroads village developed in the late eighteenth century and was occupied by both Union and Confederate troops during the Civil War. Established 1986*

***Colvin Run Mill** - The mill, built in the 1820s, and surrounding buildings were an active part of the agricultural economy of the Fairfax County throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Colvin Run Mill is a Park Authority property. Established 1972*

***Dranesville Tavern** - The tavern, built circa 1823, was a popular stopping place for those traveling the busy Leesburg and Georgetown Pikes during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries until its closing in 1968. Dranesville Tavern is a Park Authority property. Established 1972*

***Huntley** - The house, completed circa 1826, was the summer home of Thomson F. Mason, grandson of George Mason. Huntley is a Park Authority property. Established 1976*

***Lake Anne Village Center** - This award-winning cluster of residential and commercial structures was the heart of the Reston community when constructed in the mid-1960s. Established 1983*

***Langley Fork** - This crossroads village includes residential, school, and church structures dating from the early nineteenth century. Established 1980*

Mount Air - The main house, built about 1830, was lost to fire in 1992, but the house cellar, outbuildings and landscaped grounds remain. Mount Air is a Park Authority property. Established 1984

Pohick Church - The building was constructed between 1762 and 1772, with the first use of the building in the latter year. Both George Mason and George Washington had pews and attended services at Pohick Church. Established 1970

Robey's Mill - The house and mill were built in the mid-nineteenth century. The mill served local farmers until 1906. Established 1980

St Mary's Church - The first Roman Catholic Church in Fairfax County was built in 1858. It was used by Clara Barton as a hospital after the Civil War battles of Second Manassas and Chantilly (Ox Hill). The district includes portions of the nineteenth century railroad community of Fairfax Station. Established 1972

Sully - The house was built in 1794 for Richard Bland Lee who was the first U.S. congressman from Northern Virginia. He was also the uncle of Robert E. Lee. Sully is a Park Authority property. Established 1970

Woodlawn Plantation and the Pope/Leighey House - Woodlawn was built in 1805 on land owned by George Washington. The property was given by Washington as a wedding gift to his nephew Lawrence Lewis. The district also includes the Woodlawn Friends Meeting House of about 1853, the Washington Grist Mill reconstructed in 1932, and the Pope/Leighey house designed in 1942 by Frank Lloyd Wright and moved to the site in 1964. Established 1971

Currently, there are three additional proposed Historic Overlay Districts and a proposed expansion to the existing Centreville Historic District. These are:

Indian Springs-Cranford Church - The Indian Springs Farm/Cranford Church area is at the crossroads of Mason Neck. Old Colchester Road, originally known as the King's Highway, was used as the early mail road from Alexandria to Williamsburg. During the American Revolution, the route was used by George Washington and the Comte de Rochambeau to move American and French troops to engage the British at Yorktown. Several military encampments relative to that movement have been identified along its corridor. Old Colchester Road probably follows Indian trails and was the first of a series of parallel north/south routes in tidewater Fairfax County including today's Richmond Highway and Interstate Route 95.

Lebanon - The land, patented in 1657 by John Gosnell, was part of the original land grant from Thomas, 6th Lord Fairfax, to John Williams. In 1792, William Fitzhugh acquired the land and sold it to a Georgetown syndicate. Between 1807 and 1827, a local planter, Thomas Bates, purchased it. The date of the house is unknown although some say that the earliest portion dates to the 1730s. The name “Lebanon” has Biblical connotations related both to Methodism and to the cedars that lined the road leading to the house.

Town of Colchester – Colchester grew around a ferry crossing, first owned and operated by George Mason II in 1684. The Town of Colchester was chartered in 1753, and platted in 1754 on twenty-five acres of land owned by Peter Wagener. Buildings soon lined both sides of Old Colchester Road between its intersection with Furnace Road and the Occoquan River. It was a center of commerce, first for tobacco and then for the flour trade, and merchants and innkeepers, attracted by the activity of a growing port town, set up businesses. It was the location of the Occoquan tobacco warehouse, several stores and ordinaries, and the residences of local workers, factors, and other businessmen.

Proposed Expansion of the Centreville Historic Overlay District - The original Centreville Historic Overlay District (established in 1986) contained three historic houses, two historic churches and Civil War earthworks. The current proposal is to expand the district to encompass properties located in close proximity to the existing historic district.

Issue 1 Inform the Public about Implications of Development in Historic Overlay Districts

Property owners often are not aware that they reside in a Fairfax County Historic Overlay District. They do not realize what this means and what procedures they need to follow if they are making modifications to their property.

Strategies

- 1.1 Inform public how Historic Overlay Districts are established. Explore ways to inform the residents that they live in Historic Overlay Districts. Work with homeowners associations and realtors to notify residents of Historic Overlay District designation by mail, email, newsletter articles and through information disseminated in the Park Authority’s *ParkTakes*, *ResOURces Newsletter*, and on the county website.
- 1.2 Coordinate with the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and the Department of Planning and Zoning to develop a set of Standard Operating Procedures for development in Historic Overlay Districts. Publish and distribute to residents and developers and put it on the county website.

- 1.3 Complete development of policies and procedures to require archaeology in Historic Overlay Districts prior to the filing of development plans at the inception of the project.
- 1.4 Seek funding to reprint documentation on each of the Historic Overlay Districts, as well as to make the information available electronically. This would include the rules and regulations to be followed for each district. Develop a prioritized list (schedule) for the reprinting effort.
- 1.5 Verify the accuracy of the historic district designation in GIS for all parcels within historic districts. Coordinate corrections with appropriate agency.

Issue 2 Establish Additional Historic Overlay Districts to Protect Important Historic Properties

Historic Overlay Districts are buffers that have been established to protect important cultural resources from impacts resulting from neighboring development. The establishment of a Historic Overlay District requires recommendation from the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board, the Planning Commission, and approval by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. Historic Overlay Districts are proposed by the community, Board of Supervisors, ARB or Fairfax County History Commission. Historic Districts are proposed and approved by the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board. In Historic Overlay Districts, development plans for surrounding properties must be approved by the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board. Development pressures may make it difficult to establish additional Historic Overlay Districts.

Strategies

- 2.1 Coordinate closely with the Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Zoning and with the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board to establish a prioritized list of future potential Historic Overlay Districts.
- 2.2 Assist Department of Planning and Zoning and the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board in the establishment of a regular assessment of the historic properties within the historic districts.

Background

In Fairfax County, there are three levels of significance that can be attributed to cultural resources: listing in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites, the Virginia Landmarks Register and the National Register of Historic Places. Properties that are locally significant are listed in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites. Properties that are of State significance are listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register and those that meet National Register eligibility criteria are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Cultural resources include archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, standing structures, historic districts and objects.

The National Register of Historic Places, established in 1966 and managed by the National Park Service, is the official list of buildings, structures, sites, objects and districts that embody the historical and cultural foundations of the nation. There are more than 60,000 historic resources of all kinds listed nationwide and there are more than 700,000 contributing buildings in historic districts. Examples of National Register individually listed buildings include Sully and Huntley. The Alexandria Old and Historic District is an example of a National Register Historic District. Thirty-nine publicly and privately owned properties in Fairfax County are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Of those resources, seven are located on county parkland.

The National Park Service describes National Register evaluation process as:

The National Register's standards for evaluating the significance of properties were developed to recognize the accomplishments of all peoples who have made a significant contribution to our country's history and heritage. The criteria are designed to guide State and local governments, Federal agencies, and others in evaluating potential entries in the National Register.

National Register Criteria for Evaluation

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or,*
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic*

- values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*
- D. *That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

The Virginia Landmarks Register, also established in 1966 and managed by the Department of Historic Resources, is the state's official list of properties important to Virginia's history. The state utilizes the same criteria to evaluate resources for inclusion in each register. Periodically, the department publishes an updated edition of [*The Virginia Landmarks Register*](#), a book that contains a photograph and description of each property on the register.

The Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Structures recognizes resources that are locally significant, by using the National Register criteria, but also by recognizing it is possible that it qualifies under the public significance criteria. A heritage resource may be significant to the public if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. It possesses information on or represents any aspect of heritage considered important by a discrete population, ethnic group, or community; or
2. It has the potential to serve, or already serves, as a focus of community density and pride; or
3. It retains characteristics that are potentially useful in educating the public about the past and how it is studied; or
4. It enables the exhibit and display of objects, ruins, or stabilized restored structures for public education and enjoyment.

Once the applicant determines the site eligible under one of the above criteria, he or she must fill out the application and submit it to the Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning for consideration. Once appropriate staff is satisfied with the application, they will present it to the History Commission at its monthly meeting. The History Commission will review the application and vote on whether or not to add it to the Inventory.

Issue 1 Modifications to the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites

The Fairfax County History Commission granted funding to the Department of Planning and Zoning to update the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites in FY2006. The goal of this project is to verify the current status of listed properties, to evaluate the available documentation and to conduct additional research and re-photograph properties currently listed, and to add new properties to the inventory, as time allows. While this is an ambitious exercise, there are additional properties that meet the criteria for inclusion in the inventory that are not listed because either they are not known or the staffing has not been available to include these resources as part of the Inventory. In addition, the number of cultural resources other than architecture listed in the Inventory is very limited and consideration must be given to whether other resources (e.g., cemeteries, objects, battlefields or cultural landscapes) should be included in the inventory.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Partner with Department of Planning and Zoning to devise a strategy (through the use of grant funding, volunteers, and interns) to keep the inventory current and to expand the inventory to include properties that are not already listed.
- 1.2 Establish a team with the Department of Planning and Zoning to explore the possibility of expanding the Inventory to include other categories of resources, such as cemeteries, objects, battlefields, cultural landscapes.
- 1.3 Inform the Department of Planning and Zoning of previously identified buildings that may not be listed in the Inventory that have been identified by cultural resource studies, so they can be added to the Inventory.
- 1.4 Work with the Department of Planning and Zoning to develop ways to identify additional resources that should be assessed (surveyed or identified as to their possible inclusion in the Inventory.)
- 1.5 Update the GIS databases and mapping along with coordination among Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Department of Planning and Zoning and Park Authority.
- 1.6 Work with the Department of Planning and Zoning to post the Inventory on the county website with links to the Fairfax County Park Authority's *ResOURces Online* website. Explore other ways to disseminate the Inventory to the public, and inform residents of the county of its stewardship benefits.

Issue 2 Nominations to Virginia Landmarks Register

Currently, there are 52 resources from Fairfax County listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register. While this listing is often a step on the way to National Register listing, it is important because it provides the property with a certain honorary status. The listing itself has a positive impact for the county.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Compile and maintain a current list of Virginia Landmarks in the county to be posted on *ResOURces Online* on the Park Authority website.
- 2.2 Explore additional properties that can be included on the Virginia Landmarks Register. Consult with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources regarding the listing of additional properties. Develop a prioritized list and schedule for completion of nominations.
- 2.3 Expand communications with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (the State Historic Preservation Office for the Commonwealth of Virginia).
- 2.4 Utilize the information as a county marketing tool, and describe the **stewardship benefits**.

Issue 3 National Register of Historic Places Listing

Currently, there are 39 properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places in Fairfax County with seven National Register properties on Fairfax County parkland.

Listing in the National Register of Historic Places implies that the property is of considerable significance either historically, architecturally or for what it can contribute to our knowledge of history or prehistory or as a contributing resource to a National Register Historic District. National Register listing provides both an honorary status to the property and some level of protection. In light of the current changes occurring at the National Park Service and the discussions over whether properties that are eligible but not listed in the National Register of Historic Places will be given the same treatment, it is imperative to get properties listed. Should such a decision be made, it would be a change of policy.

The National Park Service describes the following with regard to National Register listing:

Listing in the National Register honors a historic place by recognizing its importance to its community, State or the Nation. Under Federal law, owners of private property listed in the National Register are free to maintain, manage, or dispose of their property as they choose provided that there is no Federal involvement. Owners have no obligation to open their properties to the public, to restore them or even to maintain them, if they choose not to do so.

The benefits of National Register listing are:

Owners of properties listed in the National Register may be eligible for a 20% investment tax credit for the certified rehabilitation of income-producing certified historic structures such as commercial, industrial, or rental residential buildings. This credit can be combined with a straight-line depreciation period of 27.5 years for residential property and 31.5 years for nonresidential property for the depreciable basis of the rehabilitated building reduced by the amount of the tax credit claimed. Federal tax deductions are also available for charitable contributions for conservation purposes of partial interests in historically important land areas or structures.

- *Consideration of historic values in the decision to issue a surface mining permit where coal is located in accordance with the Surface Mining Control Act of 1977; and*
- *Qualification for Federal grants for historic preservation, when funds are available.*

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Compile a list of properties in the county listed in the National Register of Historic Places and post this listing on *ResOURces Online*. Provide a link to the National Register of Historic Places website.

- 3.2 Identify properties on parkland that have been determined eligible for, but not listed in the National Register. Develop a prioritized list for completion of nominations.
- 3.3 Work with other historic preservation professionals and agencies in the county to develop a listing of non-park properties that have been determined eligible for, but not listed in the National Register. Develop a plan for completion of nominations. Identify methods and explore sources of staffing and funding for completing nominations.
- 3.4 Coordinate with the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board and the Fairfax County History Commission to streamline the nomination review process with emphasis on procedure and timeline.
- 3.5 Provide training for staff, interest groups, friends' groups, volunteers, Fairfax County Architecture Review Board and History Commission members about the National Register nomination process.
- 3.6 Coordinate with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and National Register of Historic Places to ensure success of the nomination process. Knowledge of why nominations are accepted or rejected will make our efforts most time and cost effective.
- 3.7 Prepare educational materials and implement training program to educate citizens about the positive effects of National Register listing.
- 3.8 Examine what tax credits are available for National Register listing at the state and federal level. Explore if there is any possibility of providing tax credits at the county level.
- 3.9 Continue to ensure that National Register eligible properties are treated in the same way as those that are listed in the National Register to provide for their protection.

Background

In order to effectively manage and protect historic cemeteries, their existence, location and contents must be documented. Currently, there are more than 400 known cemeteries in Fairfax County, 35 of which are located on parkland. As the primary preservation agency in the county, the Park Authority is mandated to protect and preserve historic cemeteries, whether located on parkland or other public lands and, when requested, on privately-owned property.

In Fairfax County, as elsewhere in Virginia, settlement in the colonial period was characterized by dispersed farms or plantations. The cultivation of tobacco and later, grains, required large tracts of land, which necessitated most of the population living at some distance from churches. Because of the early settlement patterns with few nucleated villages, only those residents who lived closest to the churches buried their dead in churchyards. The establishment of family cemeteries on farms or plantations was the most common burial pattern and continued throughout the 19th century. When the land holdings passed out of a family, family cemeteries often fell into disuse and were forgotten.

In the early years of settlement, many graves were unmarked, or marked with wooden grave markers or fieldstones. Knowledge of burial locations was often lost after one or two generations, when wooden markers deteriorated and family members were no longer around. Field stones often were not recognized as grave markers. When cemeteries were abandoned, formal stone markers often fell over or became overgrown after land passed out of family hands. Thus, the locations of the cemeteries often were forgotten. In other circumstances, the inscriptions on gravestones were eroded by weather and time, as stones sometimes sink, break and wear down, making identification of the burial difficult, if not impossible. Though many family cemeteries have eventually disappeared from the landscape, they are not always absent from the historic record. Through the archival and archaeological process, lost cemeteries may again be identified and restored.

Both federal and state laws relate to the treatment of cemeteries as historic resources. The Virginia Antiquities Act (Code of Virginia, Section 10.1-2305) sets forth the procedures to follow when a cemetery is discovered and threatened with destruction. The Act provides guidance as to the documentation and treatment of historic cemeteries and human remains from cemeteries in Virginia, including in Fairfax County.

National Register Bulletin 41 provides technical assistance to researchers wishing to list a cemetery in the National Register of Historic Places. Cemeteries that derive their significance as archaeological sites are eligible under Criterion (d):

- (d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or *history*.

Ordinarily cemeteries or graves of historical figures, as well as certain other properties are not considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within one of the categories, known as Criteria Considerations. The Criteria Consideration that applies to cemeteries is Criteria Consideration (d).

- (d) *A cemetery which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events.*

Issue 1 Development

Fairfax County continues to develop at a rapid rate as developers continue building homes, office buildings and commercial properties. Such development is contributing to the destruction of some cemeteries. Yet, surprisingly, this same activity also may lead to their identification and preservation. Policy initiated by the Board of Supervisors mandates that land developers mark known cemeteries on the conceptual plans prior to the commencement of work. In doing so, the developer provides a modicum of awareness of these highly significant and unique cultural resources, with the information being routed to the Fairfax County Park Authority and Office of Zoning. However, protection is not always assured with this singular approach. County regulation regarding construction and development must be broadened. The 1991 to 1995 Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance specified a survey of parcels under development for evidence of burial places. A return to this ordinance is highly desirable.

Information intended to protect known cemeteries may not be disseminated to the appropriate on-site staff member nor are unknown cemeteries included within the present Board of Supervisors' cemetery regulation.

Several Virginia statutes have been developed to protect human burial places. Per Code of Virginia § 18.2-126, *Violation of Sepulture*, it is a felony to disinter or disturb any human body or body part that has been deposited in any burial. Either a permit from the Department of Historic Resources or a court order is required to move or disturb a burial. Code of Virginia § 10.1-2305, *The Virginia Antiquities Act*, requires the possession of a permit from DHR to conduct any type of archaeological investigation or recovery of human remains or any associated artifacts from any burial anywhere. The county government must continue to exert pressure on developers whether in the form of recommendations or requests or creating laws and regulations aimed at the identification and avoidance of cemeteries or both. It is necessary for local County Boards and Commissions to lobby the Board of Supervisors to heighten public recognition in support of protection for cemeteries that are valued, not only as cultural resources, but also as spiritual places.

The destruction of cemeteries also can occur as the result of county, state and other public sector development. Public utilities, school construction, and park and recreation agencies and other maintenance-performing utility companies need to be required to

adhere to policies established for private development. County-owned lands under development need to be included in the identification of cemeteries. These lands may be owned by the Park Authority, Board of Supervisors, County Water Authority, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services or other agencies.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Research cemetery laws and resolutions that have been enacted at the state level and in other counties. Determine if state law is sufficient to protect cemeteries. Develop draft ordinance language for cemetery protection, if research suggests that it is a necessary addition and if it has worked in other localities.
- 1.2 Develop guidelines for the treatment of cemeteries that may be impacted by development, whether the zoning is “by right,” special exceptions, special permit or rezones. Guidelines should address the need to determine the presence or absence of burials beyond fenced boundaries of cemeteries.
- 1.3 Ensure that known cemeteries are protected during construction by the use of fencing. Preferably, a temporary chain link fence set in concrete blocks should encircle a cemetery. If this is not a feasible option, a plastic fence, a minimum of four feet in height should be erected to prevent construction equipment from infringing upon the cemetery.
- 1.4 Ensure that a 50-foot buffer is maintained around a cemetery within a development.
- 1.5 Update and release the video, *Saving our Past*, made to make development professionals aware of small private cemeteries.

Issue 2 Protection

Relic hunting, vandalism, human erosion, maintenance and natural erosion all can contribute to the eventual loss of cemeteries. Vandalism is generally a thoughtless spontaneous activity, while relic hunting is a planned activity with the purpose of collecting artifacts or human bones. It is a Class 4 felony under the Virginia Antiquities Act to willfully remove bones or defile a cemetery or grave plots. This Code is under-enforced in Fairfax County.

It is not the intent of the Park Authority to protect cemeteries through acquisition process but rather through other means such as historic easements, partnerships, technical assistance, state and federal government grants or by bringing attention to the cemetery by listing it in the Fairfax County Inventory of Historic Sites or National Register of Historic Places.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Provide public awareness of cemetery protection through lectures, posters, bookmarks, exhibits and wayside signs.
- 2.2 Propose that the current relic hunting law carry a Class 2 penalty in place of the present Class 4 misdemeanor.

- 2.3 Continue entering data in the Archaeological Management Database that provides baseline data of site changes over time. Establish a schedule of site visits to document cemetery condition, including information about relic hunting, vandalism, human erosion or environmental erosion.
- 2.4 Provide training for Park Authority maintenance staff who work with cemeteries. Training should assist staff in identifying coffin furniture and bones that may be brought to the surface by animals; these should provide guidance so staff members do not remove fieldstones or artifacts from cemeteries.
- 2.5 Work with appropriate groups to facilitate the removal of ground hogs and other burrowing animals from cemeteries to prevent further disturbance.
- 2.6 Establish an “Adopt a Cemetery” program to promote cemetery preservation.

Issue 3 Identification and Documentation

Cemeteries in Fairfax County include churchyards, private burial grounds and small family graveyards. Family graveyards are most often at risk. Information and location of some of the cemeteries may be found in the land and tax records, or in probate documents and lawsuit depositions. Other cemeteries have been documented in *Cemeteries of Fairfax County, Virginia* by Brian A. Conley of the Virginia Room, Fairfax County Public Library (1994). Cemeteries can be located through field surveys and review of historic and topographic maps and aerial photographs.

Strategies

- 3.1 Update the cemetery layer that accurately reflects the location of cemeteries in the county. This layer should be hyper-linked to data files that record information about each cemetery.
- 3.2 Document all newly identified cemeteries, as to their location, dimensions and gravestone information. Include this information in databases and files.
- 3.3 Develop a predictive model for cemetery locations by identifying attributes, including environmental considerations, family religious background, proximity to a churchyard and distance from the main house, that govern the siting of cemeteries.
- 3.4 Encourage developers or consultants to use CAD and GIS to produce cemetery maps. Such programs can be used for defining cemetery perimeters, overlaying various period maps and preparing distribution maps and visual models.
- 3.5 Use a combination of archival research, remote sensing and ground-truthing to ascertain the presence of grave shafts through archaeological surveys and cautious and limited excavations.
- 3.6 Document all gravestones before erosion and vandalism destroys the lettering and shape. Repair gravestones on park property, where possible.
- 3.7 Evaluate cemeteries to identify the benefits or detriments of interpretation. Develop self-guided tours of county cemeteries including a map, website listing identifying where historic luminaries are buried and other information to assist researchers doing family histories.

- 3.8 Coordinate with the Fairfax County Regional Library to update the listing of cemeteries and grave marker transcripts that is on the Fairfax County Library Virginia Room website.

Issue 4 Cemetery Management and Guidelines

The County Park Authority, in order to manage and protect cemeteries, should develop a “best management practice” for the successful prevention of cemetery destruction. It is not the Park Authority’s intent to acquire cemeteries through land acquisition but to provide technical assistance to property owners to encourage those who hold an easement to cemeteries to maintain their cemeteries or allow others to do so.

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Partner with Area Maintenance Crews and/or park staff to monitor cemeteries on parkland. Encourage staff to report any vandalism or relic hunting to the police and the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section. Establish a Park Watch program to ensure care of cemeteries.
- 4.2 Include Section 10.1-2211 of the Code of Virginia in the management policy and guidelines, to provide for appropriations for “extraordinary maintenance, renovation, repair, or reconstruction” in cemeteries which are on the state list.
- 4.3 Educate the public with mandatory law, 10.1-2304 of the Code of Virginia, which makes it unlawful for an individual to remove human skeletal remains from an unmarked human burial without first receiving a permit.
- 4.4 Post Section 10.1-2211 of the Code of Virginia on the Cultural Resource website. This Section was formulated to disburse funds for use in reinternment of graves of Civil War veterans through the Department of Historic Resources.
- 4.5 Follow the provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act should any Native American graves be discovered.

Background

The Park Authority is committed to the identification, evaluation, treatment, protection and interpretation of cultural landscapes as part of its initiative to record, document, inventory and assess its cultural and natural features. Cultural Landscape Reports have become an important component of the interdisciplinary study of cultural resources, as they allow for the interpretation of these resources in the context of the historic landscape they occupied. Cultural landscapes are cultural resources that require definition, monitoring and management.

Cultural landscapes include those associated with historic sites, such as Sully Plantation; designed landscapes, such as Green Spring Gardens; historic vernacular landscapes, such as Colvin Run Mill; and ethnographic landscapes, containing a variety of natural and cultural resources, such as Scotts Run Nature Preserve.

Cultural Landscape Reports add to the physical and cultural understanding and meaning of the resource under evaluation. They provide the backdrop to human interactions with the environment. Landscapes have evolved according to a complicated array of social, economic, natural and cultural events. A landscape is an artifact of historic properties and sites: a captured thought reflected in human behavior.

Most historic properties have a cultural landscape component that is integral to the significance of the resource. A historic property consists of all cultural resources – landscapes, buildings, archaeological sites and collections.

Landscapes evolve from and are dependent upon natural resources. It is these interconnected systems of land, air and water, vegetation and wildlife that have dynamic qualities that differentiate cultural landscapes from other cultural resources such as historic structures. Thus their documentation, treatment and ongoing management require a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach.

Issue 1 Definition, Importance and Benefits of Cultural Landscape Reports

A Cultural Landscape Report documents the history of a cultural landscape, identifies materials and features in the landscape, documents changes in the landscape over time, identifies the period of significance, and proposes methods for the treatment of the landscape.

Cultural landscapes fall into four categories, each of which has common threads.

Historic Designed Landscape --a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. The landscape may be associated with a significant person(s), trend or

event in landscape architecture, or may illustrate an important development in the theory and practice of landscape architecture. Aesthetic values play a significant role in designed landscapes. An example of an historic designed landscape is Green Spring Gardens, which was designed by Beatrix Farrand.

Historic Vernacular Landscape--a landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family or a community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives. Function plays a significant role in vernacular landscapes. They can be a single property such as a farm or a collection of properties, such as a district of historic farms along a river valley. Examples include rural villages, industrial complexes, and agricultural landscapes. Lanes Mill Archaeological Site and Colvin Run Mill are examples of Historic Vernacular Landscapes.

Historic Site -- a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person. Examples include battlefields and homes of people important in history. Sully Historic Site and Ox Hill Battlefield fall into this category.

Ethnographic Landscape -- a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources. Examples are contemporary settlements, religious sacred sites and massive geological structures. Small plant communities, animals, subsistence and ceremonial grounds are often components. Scotts Nature Preserve is a good example of this type of cultural landscape.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Develop criteria to determine which Park Authority properties require Cultural Landscape Reports and develop a priority list. Implement a program to complete Cultural Landscape Reports for these properties using bond funding.
- 1.2 Produce Cultural Landscape Reports for African-American sites on parkland. Grist Mill Park is the site of living quarters for enslaved peoples once owned by George Washington. The Odrick historic site is another African-American site, where a freeman was able to own land soon after the Civil War. These sites and other similar sites would benefit from a Cultural Landscape Report.
- 1.3 Develop a timetable to update existing Cultural Landscape Reports, so that they can be viewed as living documents.

■ Issue 2 Treatment and Maintenance Plans for Cultural Landscapes

Cultural landscapes exist wherever historic properties exist including in parks, on private property and in historic districts. Because most historic properties have a cultural landscape component that is essential to the significance of the resource, a Cultural Landscape Report is an important research product and treatment tool. Once the report is

complete, the challenge of implementing the Treatment and Maintenance plans of a historic landscape begins.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Establish criteria to identify those properties with resources that require treatment plans. Treatment plans include instruction for the protection, management and interpretation objectives for the property as a whole, identification of the period(s) of significance, evaluation of integrity and assessment of the condition of individual landscape features.
- 2.2 Work to incorporate Cultural Landscape Reports into the Master Planning process for priority properties. Include recommendations for resource protection zones in Cultural Landscape Reports as a map graphic.
- 2.3 Determine the level of complexity required of each Cultural Landscape Report. Treatment plans can range from simple, inexpensive preservation actions, to complex large-scale projects. Treatment should be executed at the appropriate level, reflecting the condition of the landscape with repair work identifiable upon inspection or indicated in the interpretative information. Seek funding to implement treatment plans.

Issue 3 Participants

The completion of a Cultural Landscape Report requires a diverse team of scholars to provide the specialized research required in the study. This includes historic preservation professionals, historic architects, landscape planners and designers, archaeologists and other specialists depending upon the research problems at hand. They also require support from the community, county boards and commissions, the county government and the Park Authority staff.

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Identify appropriate specialists to work on each Cultural Landscape Report project. These specialists may include GIS computer specialists, cultural and natural geographers, archaeologists, anthropologists, soil scientists, dendrochronologists and historians, among others.
- 3.2 Participate in training that can be obtained through the National Park Service and other organizations.
- 3.3 Present the results of the Cultural Landscape Reports in staff and public presentations and published manuscripts. Make Cultural Landscape Reports available on *ResOURces Online*.
- 3.4 Identify sources of funding for Cultural Landscape Reports, including bond funding, proffer funding and other county funding. Grants from state and federal sources, while difficult to obtain, are nonetheless a possible source for funds. Encourage developers to fund Cultural Landscape Reports.

- 3.5 Enlist the support of the Board of Supervisors, the Fairfax County Architectural Review Board, the Fairfax County History Commission and the Fairfax County Planning Commission for the production of Cultural Landscape Reports.
- 3.6 Coordinate with the staff of the Natural Resource Management and Protection Section and horticultural specialists from Green Spring Gardens on the development of Cultural Landscape Reports.
- 3.7 Coordinate the monitoring and enforcement of cultural landscape protection with Department of Planning and Zoning, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, Virginia Department of Transportation and federal agencies (Fort Belvoir, Coast Guard, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service).

Issue 4 How to Use

Cultural Landscape Reports identify components of a historic landscape and as such they define an important, previously ignored cultural resource. The historic landscape is made up of various components which when integrated and studied, form a Cultural Landscape Report that can provide guidance to many concerns of park management. The Cultural Landscape Report provides a context in which to evaluate and interpret the other cultural resources.

Strategies:

- 4.1 Use the Cultural Landscape Report as a tool to allow for informed decisions about the development of a property. The Cultural Landscape Report identifies both what elements are important components of the cultural landscape and what elements are not. This can be used in the placement of parking and other potential infringements on the cultural landscape.
- 4.2 Develop an inventory of plants used on a property to assist reconstruction of garden features to the period of significance for the property. Use paleoethnobotanical information to provide information about cultivars used on a property.
- 4.3 Use the data collected as part of the Cultural Landscape Report to anticipate the need for future research such as archaeology, pollen analysis, search for rare plants or contextual historical research.
- 4.4 Provide maintenance staff training.

Issue 5 Treat Big Trees as Cultural Resources

Big trees are a valuable cultural resource since older trees were a part of the historic landscape. Big trees are trees that are large for their species and generally correlate to being old trees. The location and growth pattern of big trees provides information about historic land use and settlement. For example, big trees with a spreading crown were grown in an open space environment, often near a home site.

The Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), Urban Forestry Division, maintains a Big Tree Registry. A *Fairfax County Big Tree Registry: Big Tree Nomination Form* is available on the DPWES website.

The Virginia Big Tree Database is maintained by the Virginia Forestry Association, Virginia Department of Forestry, and the Virginia Tech College of Natural Resources. There are currently 30 Fairfax County big trees listed on the database.

■ **Strategies:**

- 5.1 Add a Big Tree layer to GIS.
- 5.2 Coordinate with DPWES and Natural Resources staff to share information about big trees and develop promotional and educational materials.
- 5.3 Identify big trees and nominate them for Big Tree registries.

Plan Element Human Impact on Cultural Resources

Background

One of the greatest threats to cultural resources is the impact of human activities including development, relic hunting and vandalism, human erosion, natural hazards and encroachments. This impact can occur anywhere cultural resources exist, on or off parkland.

Within the County's parks, the Park Authority must attempt to strike a balance between cultural resource management and protection and the ability of citizens to use parks. This can be accomplished if staff responsible for Cultural Resource Management and Protection works in close partnership with other park staff to develop alternative areas for active recreation use, thereby minimizing the impact to cultural resources. While there are instances when a park cultural resource area is restricted or partially restricted to visitation, a balance must be achieved between resource management and protection and visitation. This involves early intervention in the placement of trails and other structures that could potentially impact cultural resources in areas where there will be the least impact. In the case of earthworks, the installation of elevated boardwalks can minimize impact to these fragile constructions.

Issue 1 Development

In an area subject to development, cultural resources are often threatened; and there has been a significant loss of resources county-wide as a result. Although the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section reviews development plans as part of the rezoning change and permit application processes as a means of mitigating adverse effects, cultural resources are also threatened by By-Right development. *[By-Right development means that the developer does not have to go through the rezoning, special exception, or special permit process because the property is already zoned for the proposed use. Because there is no rezoning involved, by-right development is subject solely to the requirements of applicable local codes and ordinances (i.e. the Zoning Ordinance, Public Facilities Manual, etc.). There are no public hearings required on a by-right development proposal and there is no opportunity to negotiate conditions or proffers.]*

Development also brings more people into the county, which translates into more park users. The increased park use causes a strain on the resources. Threats take the form of increased impacts on resources by noise and vibration, light, and visual intrusion. With the advent of cellular phone technology, the construction of cell towers has compromised viewsheds of significant resources. Cell towers are not the only problems for viewsheds. Changes in land use and the construction of large-scale buildings can have an adverse effect on cultural resources. Acid rain and pollution cause adverse effects to architectural resources, grave markers and other objects. Run-off and erosion have the potential to

affect the integrity of archaeological sites. Resources have been compromised by the construction of roadways, sidewalks and trails.

Site preservation is limited by the amount of available funding. This situation makes the need to instill the value of cultural resources stewardship throughout the Park Authority to include both staff and park users. While Heritage tourism heightens the awareness of cultural resources, the increased visitation may have an adverse effect on them. In addition, a buy-in on the need to protect and manage cultural resources must be achieved throughout the citizenry so that a balance can be achieved between such stewardship and development.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Continue the development of the Stewardship Education Initiative for Park Authority staff, citizens, developers, Park Authority Board and Board of Supervisors members in order to foster an appreciation of cultural resources. Identify these resources as an important component of the quality of life in the county. Make sure citizens understand the value of cultural resources and their role in preservation of the resources. Partner with Fairfax County Schools to educate children and parents.
- 1.2 Strengthen Park Policies to protect cultural resources. Review the process of strengthening cultural resource policy county-wide.
- 1.3 Work actively with developers to build partnerships. Examine programs that provide incentives for landowners and developers who promote good stewardship of cultural resources. Make use of the conservation easements programs (Department of Planning and Zoning, Park Authority and Northern Virginia Conservation Trust partners) and tax incentives for the protection of cultural resources whenever possible. Consider an awards program for citizens and developers who protect cultural resources.
- 1.4 Continue to develop a program to market cultural resource stewardship. This can include the distribution of the extant Fairfax County historic tour maps and brochures to a variety of citizens' groups, including homeowners associations; the development of programs for Channel 16; the installation of increased interpretative signage and exhibits at interpretive sites.
- 1.5 Use the Jamestown 2007 event to educate the citizenry. Look for the ways in which Fairfax County cultural resources can be related to Jamestown.

■ Issue 2 Relic Hunting/Vandalism

Relic hunting is a major problem on historic and Native American archaeological sites throughout the United States. It is so prevalent that the National Park Service initiated a database called LOOT that documents cases of looting on parkland. Looting or relic hunting on federal land is a violation of the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) as per Section 470ee, (d). Similarly, relic hunting is illegal on Fairfax County parkland as per the stipulations of Policy 203, Section 7C, which states:

*“The taking of historic or prehistoric artifacts from beneath or above the ground or disturbing the ground for the purpose of locating artifacts or using or possessing a metal or mineral detector on park property is illegal. (Section 15.1-1232 (q) Code of Virginia).**

* Title 15.1 of the Code of Virginia was recodified and renumbered effective December 1, 1997.

Numerous incidences of looting and vandalism occur on parkland. These include relic hunting and metal detecting. There are relic hunting associations that are organized around detecting Civil War artifacts, historic bottles or other artifacts. Whereas the archaeological community discourages relic hunting in all cases because it destroys the context of the artifact recovered, relic hunting on private land with owner permission is not illegal.

Vandalism is another serious threat to cultural resources. Vandalism and theft -- whether it is the wanton destruction or defacing of property as malicious mischief or “harvesting” the historic fabric of abandoned buildings in the form of doorknobs, mantles and other architectural elements -- is a direct threat to cultural resources. Part of the solution to the problems of relic hunting and vandalism is to correct citizens’ lack of understanding as to the threat caused by relic hunting. In addition, citizens often lack a sense of ownership regarding county cultural resources. Fairfax County parkland is particularly threatened by relic hunting. Without anti-relic hunting signage posted, Fairfax County police will not assist. There is no Park Police force to supplement their efforts. In addition, criminal and gang activities in parks increase the likelihood of vandalism.

■ Strategies

- 2.1 Implement a program to educate the public about relic hunting and vandalism. The National Park Service publicizes their anti-relic hunting program and is able to use this as a deterrent to relic hunting and vandalism. Establish a Park Watch program.
- 2.2 Encourage a program of community policing. Enlist *Friends* groups to protect the resources in parks. Enlist the members of the Northern Virginia Chapter of the Archeological Society of Virginia to assist in site protection. Institute an “Adopt a Park” program that allows groups to participate in the protection of cultural resources.
- 2.3 Reissue the *Don’t Pocket the Past* posters, as well as the brochures and bookmarks designed to educate the public, discourage relic hunting and develop a related marketing campaign.
- 2.4 Install No Relic Hunting signage at all parks.
- 2.5 Implement the previously conceived “Save-A-Site” program that encourages private property owners in the area who are interested in protecting archaeological sites on their property

Issue 3 Human Erosion

Human erosion is a significant impact that must be taken into consideration by the Park Authority. Human erosion can destroy archaeological sites, especially those that are fragile. An example of a site that could be threatened by human erosion is the Confederate Fortifications Historic Site (formerly known as Union Mills). This property contains earthworks and a series landscape features that could easily be eroded away or destroyed by foot traffic. Measures must be taken at sites with such fragile resources to provide visitor opportunities that will not impact resources.

Human erosion can occur to historic buildings when they are used for storage or office space. These buildings were not constructed to bear the weight of filing cabinets, map cases, photocopy machines and other heavy office equipment which can have an adverse effect throughout the building. Additionally, the wiring required for modern office equipment can negatively affect the structural integrity of the historic building. Building use should be considered before it is used for such purposes.

Erosion caused by water is a considerable impact to archaeological resources. Impervious surfaces and channelized streams cause fast runoff that result in erosion. Mountain biking can cause significant impact to earthworks or other ephemeral earthen features, as can hiking and equestrian trails. The proposed locations of trails must be reviewed and assessed as to their potential to compromise archaeological resources.

Maintenance activity can cause an impact on sensitive cultural resources. For example, in a muddy context, where the bedrock is close to the surface, merely driving a bulldozer over a site can destroy archaeological deposits. Using heavy equipment to uproot trees can negatively affect sites. Damage to historic buildings and structures can be caused inadvertently as a result of maintenance and development activities. Environmental conditions such as the presence of mold, mildew and rot can adversely affect the integrity of cultural resources.

Another type of human impact on parkland is encroachment by property owners who live adjacent to parkland. Although encroachment is an issue that largely affects natural resources, encroachments can impact cultural resources as well. Encroachments that cause ground-disturbing activity, such as weeding, certain planting and construction activities can compromise cultural resources. The Park Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plans recognize the need for greater emphasis on addressing encroachments. Community members often are unaware of the damage caused by encroachments and, they often believe that their activities are beneficial, assisting an overtaxed Park Authority staff with their jobs. Education is key in preventing further encroachments.

Agency conflicts between the protection of cultural resources and active recreation must be minimized if not resolved. Balance can be achieved most effectively, if all involved meet early and often and proactively look for solutions that cause the least impact to cultural resources.

■ Strategies

- 3.1 Continue to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and other federal regulations (the National Historic Preservation Act; the Antiquities Act; the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; the Archaeological Resource Protection Act; the National Environmental Policy Act; Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act) and state and local regulations and policies as they apply to cultural resources.
- 3.2 Develop Standing Operating Procedures for maintenance of historic sites.
- 3.3 Elevate walkways and trails over sensitive resources on Civil War Sites.
- 3.4 Partner with the staff of the Natural Resource Management and Protection Section to identify encroachments that are a threat to cultural resources. Assist appropriate staff in the program to combat encroachments.
- 3.5 Provide rotating access to certain sites with sensitive archaeological resources. If the properties are only open part of the year, this could be considered a preservation approach. For truly rare sites, consider restricting access to the most sensitive resources.
- 3.6 Minimize the effects on historic buildings when they are used as offices. Carefully consider the placement of equipment where it will have the least impact on the structure.
- 3.7 Investigate the concept of mothballing properties when there is not money for their restoration.

Issue 4 Natural Hazard and Human Action Disaster Impact

Natural Disasters such as floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, blizzards and other “acts of God” can have a serious destructive impact on cultural resources. We must also consider the possibility of terrorist attacks on buildings and the damage that terrorists’ weapons might cause to buildings, structures, sites and artifact collections, in the wake of the Pentagon bombing in September 2001. The Code of Federal Regulations was revised in 2004 to address emergency situations for federal historic properties (36CFR800.12)

■ Strategies

- 4.1 Review 36CFR800.12 Protection of Historic Properties: Emergency Situations. Establish criteria to identify sites that require special plans. Initiate Emergency Planning in order to prepare for Natural Disasters and to avert adverse effects to cultural resources. Review the work that the Collections Section has done to develop disaster planning for the Resource Management Division as part of this project.
- 4.2 Implement Disaster Planning to allow staff to secure resources, where possible.

Plan Element Education

Background

In order to promote cultural resource stewardship, it is essential that Fairfax County staff and citizens understand what cultural resources are and appreciate why they are important. Generally speaking there is a broader public understanding of natural resources and their impact on quality of life than that of cultural resources. Thus, the challenge is to both create and sustain public awareness and concern. Awareness is key to an appreciation of the value of the resources and support for cultural resource protection. Currently, an agency-wide Stewardship Education program does exist, as was mandated by the Natural Resource Management Plan. This program also applies to cultural resources as they are addressed in the Cultural Resource Management Plan. This program is underway in-house to educate Park Authority staff and is to be implemented to address a broader audience. As part of the general program, a “Primer” has been developed and a basic education exercise is being presented to all staff.

It is the duty of the Park Authority to instill a culture of stewardship. As defined by the Park Authority:

Stewardship is the careful, responsible and sustainable management of the natural and cultural resources entrusted to the Park Authority by the citizens of Fairfax County for present and future generations.

This is important for the protection of cultural resources for future generations. A public who is knowledgeable about and appreciates cultural resources will protect them, will provide fiscal support for them, and will vote for referenda for their management.

It is the mission of the Park Authority to:

...assist citizens in the protection and enhancement of environmental values; diversity of natural and cultural heritage to guarantee that these resources will be available to both present and future generations.

The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section will educate the public with the Park Authority mission in mind.

In addition to the Agency-wide stewardship education program, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section staff conducts other educational programs and produces information to be posted on websites, interpretative signs, brochures and other educational materials. Educational programs include presentations to elementary school students, with laboratory and field visits; design and implementation of courses for senior citizens; direction of high school and college internships; and training of volunteer staff. In addition, the Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section provides training

for other Park Authority staff. The Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section has a current volunteer staff of more than 20 people.

Issue 1 Providing Stewardship Education

The target audience for Cultural Resource Stewardship Education includes Park Authority staff, the Director's Leadership Team, the Park Authority Board, other county staff, the Board of Supervisors and the public, including both county residents and visitors. Different programs must be developed for different audiences, although the message of stewardship will remain consistent.

Stewardship Education serves a number of purposes.

- Knowledgeable citizens can assist in protecting cultural resources threatened by development.
- Citizens who have a sense of ownership of the resources are more likely to protect them, and can act as advocates for cultural resource protection.
- Informed citizens can act as our eyes and ears, serving as community "watchdogs," since there is not enough Park Authority staff to oversee all resources on a constant basis.
- Citizens can notify the Park Authority staff of encroachments onto parkland, inform Park Authority staff if they observe artifacts or other archaeological remains, and note and report relic hunting activities.

This knowledge and involvement instills a sense of civic pride. Informed citizens have an interest in cultural resources. They will support cultural resource-related referenda, volunteer as docents and on archaeological sites, and support programs.

Since our audience is diverse in age, in cultural background, in knowledge base and in technological experience, it is important to look for a variety of ways to present cultural resources to our many publics. Because part of our audience is transient and of various cultural backgrounds, it is a challenge to instill a "sense of place" that directly associates the population with a group of sites and material cultures. Part of our job will be to make the history of Fairfax County one that is not just honoring the American heroes who crowd this area, but also the multiple pasts of many immigrants, soldiers, tradesmen, and other ordinary people who also make up this history. It is our job to connect the dots for people between the material culture remains of a region and the personal histories of a diverse audience. Some cultural resource education programs have been less than successful because they do not make their purpose relevant to the audience. The first decade of the 21st-century is the computer/television/video game age. Television news formats present information to the public using visuals and sound bites. For some people, who are used to this means of communication and who are, in addition, busy and multi-tasking, the only hope is that they will take away from an exhibit, display, interpretative sign or program at least one clear message.

Because of this, all available options and media must be considered to communicate our message to the public.

■ Strategies

- 1.1 Ensure that all full-time, seasonal employees and volunteers are provided with training in the stewardship of cultural resources.
- 1.2 Develop stewardship messages and use them. Provide several levels of information in the interpretation of cultural resources. These may include interpretative sign with sound bites, rather than paragraphs, that are well illustrated with interesting graphics; the brochure that contains a greater level of information; and reference to the website which contains still greater levels of detail, which, in turn, links to professional papers for those wishing an extensive recounting of the event or person. Evaluate existing exhibits and signs and design future efforts to follow this model.
- 1.3 Continue to develop and implement programs to educate staff, boards and citizens (including students and seniors as well as visitors) about cultural resources.
- 1.4 Increase the number of Cultural Resource volunteers and continue to enhance the volunteer experience with opportunities to conduct fieldwork and laboratory analysis on a variety of sites. Expand the range of volunteer opportunities to include volunteer experience in GIS, cultural landscape study, oral history, historical research, architectural study, collections research and other areas of specialty. Becoming involved can help establish a sense of place for those who are new to the county.
- 1.5 Establish archaeological field school(s) either for teachers or college students. A field school for teachers would help with their recertification. A field school for students could be arranged in cooperation with a university so participants could get college credit. A field school for teachers can show them how to bring the message of cultural resource preservation back to their classroom and could link the class to the Virginia required Standards of Learning.
- 1.6 Establish the Save-a-Site program, which was previously proposed by Park Authority Cultural Resource staff, to encourage landowners to preserve sites on their own property. The program included incentives and assistance for the landowners and formal recognition of their achievement.
- 1.7 Educate the public about encroachments on parkland and their impact on cultural and natural resources. Develop a constituency who will “adopt” parks adjacent to their homes and participate in caring for those parks.
- 1.8 Work with the Park Foundation to approach corporations, businesses and Chambers of Commerce to support geographically relevant cultural resources.
- 1.9 Develop approaches for a minimum of two levels of understanding in any audience: those who have or desire understanding of cultural resources already, and those for whom the information is new. For those people who have knowledge or want to know more, it is important to provide them with better tools to spread the message to others; those who are unfamiliar with cultural resources must be provided with a basic level of understanding.
- 1.10 Work with various public and private agencies in order to establish a program to bring the idea of cultural resources to a broader audience. Since the area is transient and the community is diverse, there is a need to “Make our history your history.”

- 1.11 Coordinate with local Chambers of Commerce and other agencies and organizations to promote heritage tourism.
- 1.12 Explore funding sources to develop a variety of stewardship education programs.
- 1.13 Partner with local social studies and science teachers to determine what might be appropriate for inclusion in their programs that would conform to the Standards of Learning. Look at curriculum guides developed for Ellanor C. Lawrence Park and another developed by the Resource Stewardship Branch to determine if they should be implemented and updated or expanded. Make local schools and after-school programs aware of the curricula. Recommend the National Park Service's *Teaching With Historic Places* as a guide.
- 1.14 Arrange with Channel 16 to replay spots and interpretive videos about cultural resources produced over the years. Produce additional spots to be aired on the county channel.
- 1.15 Partner with organizations within Fairfax County with similar missions such as Mt. Vernon and Gunston Hall, to share educational resources and learn about their strategies.
- 1.16 Engage the community on a local or neighborhood level to adopt sites in order to promote stewardship; encourage volunteers to be caretakers of sites, in order to watch for vandalism, relic hunting and other detrimental effects to sites. The "Adopt a Site" program should be publicized in order to garner additional volunteers.
- 1.17 Develop a community service program for high school students interested in obtaining service hours. Identify specific programs available both at park headquarters, in the local parks, and that can be accomplished from home for students without transportation. (e.g. transcribing historical documents) Post opportunities on the website.

Appendix I: Glossary

Archaeology. Archaeology is the scientific study of material remains of human cultural from the past recovered through excavation.

Archaeological Site. A location where evidence of past human occupation remains below the ground.

Artifact. Objects made or used by people

Buffer. Graduated mix of land uses, building heights or intensities designed to mitigate potential conflicts between different types or intensities of land uses; may also provide for a transition between uses. A landscaped buffer may be an area of open, undeveloped land and may include a combination of fences, walls, berms, open space and/or landscape plantings. A buffer is not necessarily coincident with transitional screening.

Building. A building is a structure created to shelter any form of human activity, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar structure. Building may refer to a historically related complex such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn.

“By-right”. Use that is permitted in a given zoning district without the need for any additional review or approval.

Cultural Landscape. A geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein), associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values. There are four general types of cultural landscapes, not mutually exclusive: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, historic vernacular landscapes, and ethnographic landscapes.

Cultural Landscape Report. A report that documents a cultural landscape identifies a period of significance for that landscape and recommends treatment for preservation of the landscape.

Cultural Resource. Cultural Resources are physical elements associated with past human occupation. These include archaeological sites; historic buildings, structures, objects or districts; traditional cultural properties; cemeteries; and cultural landscapes.

Diagnostics. Artifacts that are recognized and understood as to manufacturing technique and in a style that allows for identification and their placement in a typology for which time ranges have been established

Feature. Something made or used by man that is so large or complex that it cannot be conveniently be brought back to the lab for study, for example a brick-lined cellar.

Fire Cracked Rock. Rock that is cracked by heating with fire. This can be the result of stone being used to line a hearth or campfire or stone used in ‘stone boiling’ for

cooking food. Rocks (cobbles) were placed in a fire. When they were sufficiently heated, they were transferred in to a container of liquid which caused it to heat. The rapid expansion and contraction of the stones caused them to fracture and they were disposed and became part of the archaeological record.

Fairfax County Historic Overlay District. Historic Overlay Districts are entities established by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors that include historic properties and acreage around them. The purpose of the Historic Overlay District is to protect the historic resources contained therein.

Historic District. (See National Register Historic District)

Historic Site. A historic site is a property significant for its association with a historic event, activity or person.

Historic Structures Report. A historic structures report consists of documentation for a building, structure or group of buildings and structures of recognized significance for the purpose of recording and analyzing the property's initial construction and significant alterations through time through historical, physical and pictorial evidence; documentation of the performance and condition of the buildings architectural components and overall structural stability; identification and appropriate course of treatment; and documentation of the alterations made through that treatment.

Integrity. The authenticity of a property's historic identity, evinced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period. The seven qualities of integrity as defined by the National Register Program are location, setting, feeling, association, design, workmanship, and materials.

National Register Historic District. A district is a geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district may also comprise individual elements separated geographically but linked by association or history.

National Register of Historic Places. The National Register of Historic Places, established in 1966 and managed by the National Park Service, is the official list of structures, sites, objects, and districts that embody the historical and cultural foundations of the nation.

Object. An object is a material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historical or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, movable yet related to a specific setting or environment

Park Comprehensive Plan. Constructs the framework for the Park Authority's governance, including the Park Classification System. The Park Comprehensive Plan also defines Stewardship and the direction for implementing the Park Comprehensive Plan by

identifying strategies that are planning and development, based on the countywide needs assessed in the Park Comprehensive plan.

Phase I. Archaeological survey, the goal of which is to determine the presence or absence of archaeological resources. Phase I archaeological survey may include shovel testing at regular intervals; examination of plowed fields or erosional zones; or the excavation of backhoe trenches in deeply buried contexts to remove fill that overlays the ground surface from the past.

Phase II. Archaeological testing, comprised of the excavation of square or rectangular test units and shovel tests to determine site integrity (is the site intact or disturbed); site boundaries; cultural affiliation (what period does it date to and who might have lived there) and an evaluation of the site's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Phase III. Archaeological Data Recovery Excavations to document a site. This level of study includes a research design that spells out what is proposed for the site.

Preservation. This treatment option places a high premium on the retention of all historic fabric through conservation, maintenance and repair. It reflects a building's continuum over time, through successive occupancies, and the respectful changes and alterations that are made. This treatment option is the first choice, where possible.

Proffer: A written condition, which, when offered voluntarily by a property owner and accepted by the Board of Supervisors in a rezoning action, becomes a legally binding condition which is in addition to the zoning district regulations applicable to a specific property. Proffers are submitted and signed by an owner prior to the Board of Supervisors public hearing on a rezoning application and run with the land. Once accepted by the Board, proffers may be modified only by a proffered condition amendment (PCA) application or other zoning action of the Board and the hearing process required for a rezoning application applies. See Sect. 15.2-2303 (formerly 15.1-491) of the Code of Virginia.

Provenance. Provenance is the ownership history of a museum object.

Provenience. Provenience is the horizontal and vertical location where an archaeological artifact is found on a site.

Public Significance. Public Significance is the evaluation of county resources, especially those that don't meet the criteria for National Register eligibility, from the viewpoint of public values. For example, a remnant of a Civil War earthwork that has been subjected to relic-hunter activity retains little archaeological integrity and would probably not meet National Register criteria. The local community, however, may care very strongly for its "own piece of history".

Rehabilitation This treatment option for historic structures emphasizes the retention and repair of historic materials, but more latitude is provided for replacement because it is assumed the property is more deteriorated prior to work than a property where preservation is the selected treatment option. (Both Preservation and Rehabilitation standards focus attention on the preservation of those materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that, together, give a property its historic character.) This treatment option is the second choice, where possible.

Reconstruction This treatment option establishes limited opportunities to re-create a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object in all new materials. This treatment option is the fourth choice.

Resource Management Area (RMA): That component of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area comprised of lands that, if improperly used or developed, have a potential for causing significant water quality degradation or for diminishing the functional value of the Resource Protection Area. See Fairfax County Code, Ch. 118, Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance.

Resource Protection Area (RPA): That component of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area comprised of lands at or near the shoreline or water's edge that have an intrinsic water quality value due to the ecological and biological processes they perform or are sensitive to impacts which may result in significant degradation of the quality of state waters. In their natural condition, these lands provide for the removal, reduction or assimilation of sediments from runoff entering the Bay and its tributaries, and minimize the adverse effects of human activities on state waters and aquatic resources. New development is generally discouraged in an RPA. See Fairfax County Code, Ch. 118, Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance.

Restoration This treatment option focuses on the retention of materials from the most significant time in a property's history, while permitting the removal of materials from other periods. This treatment option is the third choice, where possible.

Significance. For historic properties, significance usually can be equated with National Register eligibility. The meaning or value is ascribed to a cultural resource based upon the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity.

Site. A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself maintains historical or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

Site Plan: A detailed engineering plan, to scale, depicting the development of a parcel of land and containing all information required by Article 17 of the Zoning Ordinance. Generally, submission of a site plan to DPWES for review and approval is required for all residential, commercial and industrial development except for development of single

family detached dwellings. The site plan is required to assure that development complies with the Zoning Ordinance.

Special Exception (SE)/Special Permit (SP): Uses, which by their nature, can have an undue impact upon or can be incompatible with other land uses and therefore need a site specific review. After review, such uses may be allowed to locate within given designated zoning districts if appropriate and only under special controls, limitations, and regulations. A special exception is subject to public hearings by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors with approval by the Board of Supervisors; a special permit requires a public hearing and approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Unlike proffers which are voluntary, the Board of Supervisors or BZA may impose reasonable conditions to assure, for example, compatibility and safety. See Article 8, Special Permits and Article 9, Special Exceptions, of the Zoning Ordinance.

Stewardship. Stewardship is the careful, responsible and sustainable management of the natural and cultural resources entrusted to the Park Authority by the citizens of Fairfax County for present and future generations.

Strategic Plan. Strategic Plans provide direction for implementing the Park Comprehensive Plan by identifying strategies which are well defined in scope and achievable within successive five year time frames. The strategic planning element focuses attention on the external and internal environments within which the Park Authority will operate during the identified time period, including the political, economic, social and technological forces and trends which may be expected to influence the agency's decisions and ability to achieve stated objectives. Within this context and time frame, Strategic Plans identify priorities for land acquisition, resource management and park site planning and development, based on the countywide needs assessed in the Park Comprehensive Plan. Action Agendas for the Stewardship and Recreation Services Programs identify additional priorities for operations, maintenance and public programming. These priorities are then translated into the adopted Capital Improvement Program and phased through annual budget and staffing plans.

Structure. A structure is a work made up of interdependent and interrelated parts in a definite pattern of organization. Constructed by man, it is often an engineering project large in scale.

Survey. A study to inventory what cultural resources are present in an area.

Traditional Cultural Property. Traditional Cultural Properties are defined as eligible for inclusion in the National register of Historic Places because of their association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that a) are rooted in that community's history, and b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.

Treatment. Treatment is work carried out to achieve a particular historic preservation goal. For an archaeological site, treatment may be preservation in place or data recovery

excavation. For a building, it may be preservation or Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record documentation.

Appendix II: Policy and Regulatory Background

COUNTY POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

Park Authority Mission Statement. To set aside public spaces for and assist citizens in the protection and enhancement of environmental values, diversity of natural habitats and cultural heritage to guarantee that these resources will be available to both present and future generations. To create and sustain quality facilities and services which offer citizens opportunities for recreation, improvement of their physical and mental well being, and enhancement of their quality of life.

Park Authority Policies Related to Cultural Resource Management.

The Park Authority Policy Manual provides guidance to both the Park Authority Board and staff in the decision making process. The following is a brief presentation of the objectives and policies applicable to cultural resources.

Objective 100 provides for local parklands and conservation of cultural resources for the benefit of current and future citizens.

Policy 101 establishes a countywide park planning framework for the acquisition and development of public parks and for the conservation of significant cultural resources. This policy also requires the agency to balance resource stewardship with the provision of recreational services, suggests that land adjacent to existing parks be acquired whenever feasible to enhance resource protection, and calls for the interpretation and educational programs to increase citizen understanding and protection of environmental, cultural and horticultural resources.

Policy 101.1 sets forth land acquisition criteria for recreational development. The policy sets forth the minimum acreage of parkland required per 1000 population and the accepted driving times to reach the various park types. Both homeowner association lands and school sites may be used to meet the standards. This policy also requires that the Park Authority develop criteria for the acquisition and/or protection of cultural resource sites.

Policy 101.2 establishes the guidelines and mandates participation in the county's development review process. The intent is to mitigate the adverse impact of development on parklands and encourage the dedication of land for park use.

Policy 101.3 defines greenways as linear open space corridors. These corridors include parks, areas of significant cultural or natural resources, residential communities, commercial centers, and transit areas. Trails and sidewalks provide the connectivity among various greenway and cultural resources components. The policy also identifies the stream valleys for acquisition and includes the provisions of the 1973 Stream Valley Park Plan which became the basis of Fairfax County's environmental quality corridor (EQC) system.

Policy 102 sets forth a hierarchy of plans within the park planning process. The Park Comprehensive Plan identifies the county's long range needs (10-15 years) for cultural resource protection. The Strategic Plan implements the Park Comprehensive Plan. It sets forth the priorities to be implemented within a five year period. For land acquisition, resource management, planning and development. Fiscal plans identify the funding sources and requirements needed to implement the strategic plan priorities. In addition to the system-wide plans, the park planning process provides for a hierarchy of plans for the development of individual parks. This includes the preparation of General Management Plans, Conceptual Development Plans and Project Implementation Plans. Each plan provides an increasing level of detail.

Policy 103 sets for the park planning and development process for individual parks. General Management Plans define the park's purpose, classification, and management framework. The site's cultural and natural assets and physical constraints are incorporated into the management zones. Conceptual Development plans provide for the location and conceptual design of development within the management zones. Project Implementation Plans define the specific development details, identify the phasing and contain cost estimates. The policy notes the desirability of reviewing park master plans at least every ten years.

Policy 103.1 requires park development criteria and standards be established in the Park Classification System. Development is to be predicated on responsible stewardship and perpetuation of all cultural and natural resources.

Policy 203 Cultural Resources

The framework for cultural resource management is laid out in the Park Comprehensive Plan, Objective 3, as seen in Section A below:

A. In support of its mission to preserve and protect significant archaeological and historic resources of the County the Fairfax County Park Authority shall:

Determine significance and appropriate preservation options for cultural resources proposed for inclusion in the County park system in accordance with the U.S. Department of Interior National Register of Historic Places and the Fairfax County criteria for Public Significance.

Protect significant cultural resources, including archaeological sites, historic properties, structures, landscapes and artifacts from degradation or damage and destruction.

Locate, identify and evaluate the significance of cultural resources on park lands as part of all site planning and development.

Establish educational and interpretive facilities and programming at designated cultural resource sites in accordance with adopted criteria and standards.

Consider alternatives to fee simple acquisition of historic properties shall be considered if adequate resources are not available to ensure stabilization; restoration and planning for appropriate site use.

Provide incentives for private landowners to protect and preserve significant cultural resources.

Coordinate preservation of significant cultural resources with County, municipal, regional, state and federal agencies to provide effective countywide management of cultural resources.

In its role as the primary steward of Fairfax County's cultural resources, it shall be the policy of the Authority to preserve and protect significant cultural resources.

1. The Authority shall inventory, evaluate and register cultural resources located on park land according to federal, state and local regulations and laws. Significance of cultural resources shall be defined by the U.S. Department of the Interior standards, and local historical standards, as defined by the Authority. These evaluations will be incorporated into strategic and long range planning, general management planning, and operational planning, including the integration with land management and the facility design process.

2. Cultural resources management will reflect federal, state, and local laws and policy, Park Authority policy, and regulations, cultural resource management stewardship obligations and approved park plans. Cultural resource management will be conducted using current professional standards.

3. It shall be the policy of the Authority to identify cultural resources on all parkland for protection, study and educational purposes.

4. Park development and the granting of easements, permanent or temporary, shall take into consideration the degree to which cultural resources will be affected by the undertaking; alternative plans for the protection or mitigation of those cultural resources must be presented as part of the development proposal.

5. The development of parks will be restricted to permitted activities within the Cultural Resource Protection Zones, as defined by the approved park plan.

6. Parks without an approved park plan will be managed to ensure the protection of cultural resources located there.

7. The Authority shall require restoration or mitigation of cultural resources adversely affected by encroachment by any entity.

C. The taking of historic or prehistoric artifacts from beneath or above the ground or disturbing the ground for the purpose of locating artifacts or using or possessing a metal or mineral detector on park property is illegal. (Section 15.1-1232 (q) Code of Virginia).*

* Title 15.1 of the Code of Virginia was recodified and renumbered effective December 1, 1997.

NOTE: Cultural resources are identified as "heritage" resources in the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 204 Countywide Heritage Resource Archaeology

Consistent with the Park Authority's long standing heritage resource stewardship mission, in accordance with guidelines outlined in the Fairfax County Heritage Resource Management Plan (Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, 1988) and in recognition of the need to provide a broader cultural context for heritage resources contained within the park system, it is Park Authority policy to seek an optimum balance between countywide archaeological resource conservation and normal economic growth in the county. To this end the Park Authority shall:

1. Represent the countywide interest of archaeological resource conservation in the federal, state, and county review processes.
2. Through an active partnership with volunteers and avocational and professional archaeologists, conserve and recover threatened archaeological resources not otherwise protected by federal, state regional or county laws, guidelines or ordinances.
3. Serve as the central depository for archaeological collections (artifacts and related documents) recovered in Fairfax County, and for such collections that have relevance to the interpretation of the county's past (for which there are no suitable alternative collections facility).
4. Understanding that successfully achieving the broader goal of heritage resource conservation rests upon a strong stewardship ethic among residents, develop and implement active programs to educate county citizens and visitors in the county's heritage and its conservation.

Adopted October 28, 1998

Policy 205 Historic Restoration

Following guidelines established by the National Trust for Historic Preservation* and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*, the Park Authority policy on historic restoration requires that treatment of cultural resources with structural integrity shall be performed according to the following philosophical principles:

- A. Generally, it is better to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, better to restore than reconstruct.

B. Usually, it is better to retain genuine old work of several periods than to arbitrarily "restore" the whole by new work to its aspect at a single period.

C. Every reasonable care and expense is justified to approximate in new work the materials, methods and quality of old construction.

D. Modern uses should be consistent with the preservation of the building's values.

* See Appendix 15, Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations in Virginia, p. A-100; Appendix 16, Guidelines and Procedures for Historic Collections Management, p. A-117; and Appendix 14, Curatorial Care of Archaeological Objects, p. A-71.

Revised and adopted October 28, 1998

Policy 206 Historic Collections

The Fairfax County Park Authority shall collect, preserve, exhibit, interpret and, where appropriate, make available for research prehistoric artifacts, historic artifacts and material culture. The Authority shall ensure that collections under its stewardship are protected, secure, unencumbered, cared for, accounted for and documented, and shall plan for their future needs and growth. Acquisition, loan, deaccessioning and disposal activities shall be conducted in a manner that respects the protection and preservation of natural and cultural resources and refutes illicit trade in such materials. The unique and special nature of human remains, funerary and sacred objects shall be recognized as the basis of all decisions concerning such collections. Collections-related activities shall promote the public good rather than individual financial gain.

The Authority shall subscribe to the American Association of Museums "Code of Ethics for Museums" (1993), as it applies to historic collections, the Historic Collections Policy and all collections management procedures. The Authority shall maintain detailed guidelines and procedures for the management and care of the historic artifact and archaeological collections in respective conformity with professional standards established by the American Association of Museums and State Curation Standards as defined by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Collections procedures shall address the Scope of Collections, acquisitions, loans, deaccessioning and disposal and shall be revised as needed to comply with professional and Commonwealth guidelines.

The Authority shall collect artifacts, archival materials, architectural and archaeological fragments, and other material culture and reference materials in support of the Authority mission. Collected objects and materials shall be associated with or represent at least one of the following categories: the history of the historic structures, sites and parks; the history of individuals residing in or businesses operating at those historic structures, sites and parks; the cultural origins connected with those historic structures, sites and parks; and the general prehistory, history, growth and development of Fairfax County. Where

possible, original objects shall be collected, but where appropriate, reproductions may be acquired to support interpretation. Historic collections shall be classified as follows: prehistoric and historic artifacts, archival materials, architectural fragments, archaeological materials, and property items (other material culture conforming to the scope of collections). Collections guidelines shall define these classifications, detail what may be included in them and state their purpose(s).

Acquisitions may be acquired through gift, purchase, bequest, exchange, field collection or other transactions whereby title of ownership is transferred to the Authority. Board members and staff are discouraged from collecting privately in competition with the Authority, and the Authority shall not purchase acquisitions of historic objects from Board members, staff or volunteers.

Collections guidelines and procedures shall detail the conditions under which objects and materials may be acquired, define the criteria for their evaluation, and state the rights and responsibilities of the Authority regarding donations as well as incoming and outgoing loans. The Authority will not knowingly accept any artifact that has been stolen or illegally exported from its country of origin or whose recovery involved destruction of historic or archaeological sites, structures, objects for the purpose of their acquisition. All donations of historic objects are considered outright and unrestricted gifts to be used at the sole discretion of the Authority and shall include full literary rights, property rights, copyrights, patents and trademarks. The Authority assumes no responsibility for the appraisal of objects or materials offered as gifts, and no staff member may reproduce objects from the Authority collections for private sale or gain. Loans from the Authority shall be made only to institutions able to provide objects the proper care and protection and shall be made only for educational or research purposes.

A historic artifact may be recommended for deaccessioning if no restrictions prohibit its removal and if at least one of the following criteria is met: it is not relevant or useful to the stated purposes of the Authority or is outside the Scope of Collections; it has failed to retain its identity or authenticity, and has deteriorated beyond usefulness or practicable conservation; it has been lost or stolen and remains lost for longer than five years or five inventories; it duplicates other objects or materials in the collection; or the Authority lacks the resources to properly conserve it. Disposal of collections through sale, exchange or research activities is solely for the advancement of the Authority mission. No Authority Board member, staff or their immediate families or representatives may acquire any deaccessioned object. Proceeds from the sale of historic artifacts shall be used only for acquisitions or direct care of collections.

The Authority shall maintain a permanent record of each historic artifact accession with its documentation, including all legal instruments, agreements, conveyances, research and descriptive catalog records. Such acquisitions and loans shall be insured through a museum fine arts policy, unless specifically stated in writing as otherwise insured, and every attempt shall be made to maintain current insurance values for these objects. Outgoing loans shall be insured by the borrower, unless specifically stated in writing as otherwise insured. Objects left in temporary custody shall not be covered by Authority

insurance, and if unclaimed after one year, any such item shall become an unrestricted gift to the Authority.

Revised and adopted October 28, 1998

Object 300 insures the long term protection, preservation and sustainability of park resources.

Policy 301 states that the Park Authority shall protect lands and facilities that it owns as a public trust and shall resist any effort to encroach upon or destroy and park, historical site, natural area or recreational facility. It requires the agency to enlist the aid or the citizenry in support of this policy.

Policy 303 indicates that the citing of telecommunications facilities on parklands is only permitted when there are no prudent alternative sites. Proposed sites should not adversely impact any cultural or natural resources. The policy requires that the revenue from telecommunication facilities be use solely at the park site where the facility is located during the initial license term.

Policy 304 regarding regional stormwater management facilities requires the Park Authority to limit the placement of such facilities on parkland unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative, and unless the facilities will not adversely affect significant cultural and natural resources.

Policy 305 on sustainable management practices states that park lands shall be protected from vandalism, dumping of debris, and unauthorized uses including encroachments, and removal of artifacts, minerals or damaging of cultural features.

Strategic Plan

The Fairfax County Park Authority Strategic Plan: 1996-2000, adopted by the Park Authority Board in April 1996, authorized the preparation of an agency-wide cultural resources management plan. The Park Comprehensive Plan had previously provided general guidelines for the preparation of a cultural resources management plan.

The Fairfax County Park Authority Strategic Plan: 1996-2000, adopted by the Park Authority Board in September 2001, and was updated in 2003 for the years 2002-2006. This five year plan directs resources to the agency's critical work. Six categories of steward ship issues were identified. Four of these categories are related to cultural resource management. These include:

- Preserving open space
- Protecting park resources
- Expanding resource management
- Resolving encroachments

These management issues are addressed in the Cultural Resources Management Plan.

The Strategic Plan also presents seven values that “describe the essence of our organization,” the first of which is called Enhancing Stewardship: “We are the stewards for a wonderfully rich community trust of natural and cultural resources. We will provide the leadership to expand awareness, appreciation and protection of this heritage.

**FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, 2003 Edition POLICY PLAN
Park and Recreation, Amended through 6-20-2005**

Objective 3: Protect and preserve significant cultural resources on parklands.

- Policy a: Determine the significance and appropriate preservation options for cultural resources that are proposed for inclusion in the integrated park system in accordance with the criteria for the U.S. Department of Interior National Register of Historic Places and the Fairfax County Criteria for Public Significance (See Objective 2, Policies a. and b. in the Heritage Resources section.)
- Policy b: Protect significant cultural resources, including archaeological sites, historic properties, buildings, structures, districts, landscapes, cemeteries and artifacts from degradation or damage and destruction.
- Policy c: Consider alternatives, in addition to fee-simple acquisition of cultural resources, such as the establishment of protective easements, to ensure preservation, stabilization, restoration and appropriate site planning and development.
- Policy d: Coordinate preservation of significant cultural resources with County, municipal, regional, state and federal agencies to ensure effective and consistent management and protection of these resources.

Appendix 1: Park Classification System

D. RESOURCE-BASED PARKS

Purpose

This classification includes parks that primarily preserve, protect, and interpret natural and/or cultural resources.

Location and Access

The location for Resource-based Parks is determined by the location of the specific resources. Size and access can take many forms depending on the setting and type of resources. Access to stream valleys is primarily by trails; however trailheads with parking should be strategically located along trail routes. Management plans should give consideration to the resource and allow public use only as it is compatible with resource protection.

Character and Extent of Development

Resource-based Parks are selected for inclusion in the park system because of their exemplary natural and/or cultural features and are acquired, identified and preserved for stewardship and protection. Protection and stewardship of unique natural and cultural resources provide a variety of public benefits. These parks provide educational and interpretative opportunities relative to environmental and cultural resources. These lands may offer opportunities to restore degraded areas and to protect, increase and restore biodiversity of species that may inhabit these areas. In addition, passive recreation opportunities and facilities are also appropriate at these parks. Development which does not adversely affect resources and which enhances awareness of the resource values is appropriate. Development of public sites should include opportunities for public education and enjoyment. Interpretive (educational) facilities and structures may include visitor centers, nature centers, orientation kiosks, nature watching stations, demonstration areas, preserved buildings and gardens, hiking, biking and equestrian trails as designated. To the extent that they do not adversely impact the resources themselves, support amenities may also be developed such as picnicking areas, restrooms, signs, benches and parking. Trails and trail connections are a significant feature at these parks, especially along stream valleys and often serve as Countywide trail connections.

Stream valleys are a predominant physiographic feature of Fairfax County and comprise the core of the County's Environmental Quality Corridor (EQC) system. Parks located in and along the stream valleys encompass those segments of EQCs planned for public parkland and comprise the core elements of a greenway network that links areas notable for significant natural and cultural resources with residential and employment areas throughout the County. They may vary in size and character from steeply sloped corridors with cascading streams to broad floodplains; all are treated as sensitive environmental areas. Trails within stream valleys should be located to be sensitive to environmental conditions. In addition to trails, seating areas, small picnic and open play areas, landscaping and interpretive structures may also be developed, if they do not adversely impact the EQC or ecological functions.

The user experience at Resource-based Parks will be varied. These parks support nature, horticulture and history programs as well as more casual interests such as gardening, nature watching and appreciation of local, regional, state and national history. Settings for quiet contemplation are appropriate in these parks. Visitors may frequent these parks on a regular or occasional basis.

The Area Plans element of the Comprehensive Plan delineates the park classifications of all park sites in the County. The specific types of facilities and support amenities, such as parking, lighting and restrooms, to be developed at each Resource-Based Park is determined by the managing agency with public participation through its Park Planning and Development process.

<http://www/fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/parksrec.pdf>

State Regulations and Guidelines

Guidelines for Conducting Cultural Resource Surveys in Virginia
http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/review/Survey_Manual_Web.pdf

The Virginia Antiquities Act (Code of Virginia, Section 10.1-2300 et seq.)

§ 10.1-2300. Definitions.

As used in this chapter, unless the context requires a different meaning:

"Field investigation" means the study of the traces of human culture at any site by means of surveying, sampling, excavating, or removing surface or subsurface material, or going on a site with that intent.

"Object of antiquity" means any relic, artifact, remain, including human skeletal remains, specimen, or other archaeological article that may be found on, in or below the surface of the earth which has historic, scientific, archaeological or educational value.

"Person" means any natural individual, partnership, association, corporation or other legal entity.

"Site" means a geographical area on dry land that contains any evidence of human activity which is or may be the source of important historic, scientific, archaeological or educational data or objects.

"State archaeological site" means an area designated by the Department in which it is reasonable to expect to find objects of antiquity.

"State archaeological zone" means an interrelated grouping of state archaeological sites.

"State-controlled land" means any land owned by the Commonwealth or under the primary administrative jurisdiction of any state agency. State agency shall not mean any county, city or town, or any board or authority organized under state law to perform local or regional functions. Such land includes but is not limited to state parks, state wildlife areas, state recreation areas, highway rights-of-way and state-owned easements.

(1977, c. 424, § 10-150.3; 1984, c. 750; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-900; 1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2301. Duties of Director.

The Director shall:

1. Coordinate all archaeological research on state-controlled land and in state archaeological sites and zones;

2. Coordinate a survey of significant archaeological sites located on state-controlled land, and upon request, survey and officially recognize significant archaeological sites on privately owned property;
3. Identify, evaluate, preserve and protect sites and objects of antiquity which have historic, scientific, archaeologic or educational value and are located on state-controlled land or on state archaeological sites or zones;
4. Protect archaeological sites and objects located on state-controlled land or on state archaeological sites or zones from neglect, desecration, damage and destruction;
5. Ensure that archaeological sites and objects located on state-controlled land or on state archaeological sites or zones are identified, evaluated and properly explored so that adequate records may be made;
6. Encourage private owners of designated state archaeological sites to cooperate with the Commonwealth to preserve the site; and
7. Encourage a statewide archaeological education program to inform the general public of the importance of its irreplaceable archaeological heritage.

(1977, c. 424, §§ 10-150.2, 10-150.8; 1984, c. 750; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-901; 1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2302. Permit required to conduct field investigations; ownership of objects of antiquity; penalty.

A. It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct any type of field investigation, exploration or recovery operation involving the removal, destruction or disturbance of any object of antiquity on state-controlled land, or on a state archaeological site or zone without first receiving a permit from the Director.

B. The Director may issue a permit to conduct field investigations if the Director finds that it is in the best interest of the Commonwealth, and the applicant is a historic, scientific, or educational institution, professional archaeologist or amateur, who is qualified and recognized in the area of field investigations or archaeology.

C. The permit shall require that all objects of antiquity that are recovered from state-controlled land shall be the exclusive property of the Commonwealth. Title to some or all objects of antiquity which are discovered or removed from a state archaeological site not located on state-controlled land may be retained by the owner of such land. All objects of antiquity that are discovered or recovered on or from state-controlled land shall be retained by the Commonwealth, unless they are released to the applicant by the Director.

D. All field investigations, explorations, or recovery operations undertaken pursuant to a permit issued under this section shall be carried out under the general supervision of the

Director and in a manner to ensure that the maximum amount of historic, scientific, archaeological and educational information may be recovered and preserved in addition to the physical recovery of objects.

E. If the field investigation described in the application is likely to interfere with the activity of any state agency, no permit shall be issued unless the applicant has secured the written approval of such agency.

F. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor.

(1977, c. 424, § 10-150.5; 1984, c. 750; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-903; 1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2303. Control of archaeological sites; authority of Director to contract.

A. The Commonwealth of Virginia reserves to itself, through the Director, the exclusive right and privilege of field investigation on sites that are on state-controlled land. The Director shall first obtain all permits of other state agencies required by law. The Director is authorized to permit others to conduct such investigations.

B. All objects of antiquity derived from or found on state-controlled land shall remain the property of the Commonwealth.

(1977, c. 424, §§ 10-150.4, 10-150.6; 1984, c. 750; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-904; 1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2304. Designating archaeological sites and zones.

The Director may designate state archaeological sites and state archaeological zones on private property or on property owned by any county, city or town, or board or authority organized to perform local or regional functions in the Commonwealth provided that the Director secures the express prior written consent of the owner of the property involved. No state archaeological site or zone located on private property may be established within the boundaries of any county, city or town which has established a local archaeological commission or similar entity designated to preserve, protect and identify local sites and objects of antiquity without the consent of the local governing body. Field investigations may not be conducted on a designated site without a permit issued by the Director pursuant to § [10.1-2302](#).

(1977, c. 424, § 10-150.7; 1984, c. 750; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-905; 1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2305. Permit required for the archaeological excavation of human remains.

A. It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct any type of archaeological field investigation involving the removal of human skeletal remains or associated artifacts

from any unmarked human burial regardless of age of an archaeological site and regardless of ownership without first receiving a permit from the Director.

B. Where unmarked burials are not part of a legally chartered cemetery, archaeological excavation of such burials pursuant to a permit from the Director shall be exempt from the requirements of §§ [57-38.1](#) and [57-39](#). However, such exemption shall not apply in the case of human burials within formally chartered cemeteries that have been abandoned.

C. The Department shall be considered an interested party in court proceedings considering the abandonment of legally constituted cemeteries or family graveyards with historic significance. A permit from the Director is required if archaeological investigations are undertaken as a part of a court-approved removal of a cemetery.

D. The Board shall promulgate regulations implementing this section that provide for appropriate public notice prior to issuance of a permit, provide for appropriate treatment of excavated remains, the scientific quality of the research conducted on the remains, and the appropriate disposition of the remains upon completion of the research. The Department may carry out such excavations and research without a permit, provided that it has complied with the substantive requirements of the regulations promulgated pursuant to this section.

E. Any interested party may appeal the Director's decision to issue a permit or to act directly to excavate human remains to the local circuit court. Such appeal must be filed within fourteen days of the Director's decision.

(1989, c. 656.)

§ 10.1-2306. Violations; penalty.

It shall be unlawful to intentionally deface, damage, destroy, displace, disturb or remove any object of antiquity on any designated state archaeological site or state-controlled land.

Any person who violates this section shall be guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor.

(1977, c. 424, § 10-150.10; 1988, c. 891, § 10.1-906; 1989, c. 656.)

Add the following Virginia statutes concerning human burials:

§ 18.2-126. Violation of sepulture; defilement of a dead human body; penalties.

A. If a person unlawfully disinters or displaces a dead human body, or any part of a dead human body which has been deposited in any vault, grave or other burial place, he is guilty of a Class 4 felony.

B. If a person willfully and intentionally physically defiles a dead human body he is guilty of a Class 6 felony. For the purposes of this section, the term "defile" shall not include any autopsy or the recovery of organs or tissues for transplantation, or any other lawful purpose.

(Code 1950, § 18.1-243; 1960, c. 358; 1975, cc. 14, 15; 1995, c. 306.)

§ 10.1-2211. Disbursement of funds appropriated for caring for Confederate cemeteries and graves.

A. At the direction of the Director, the Comptroller of the Commonwealth is instructed and empowered to draw annual warrants upon the State Treasurer from any sums that may be provided in the general appropriation act, in favor of the treasurers of the Confederate memorial associations and chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy set forth in subsection B of this section. Such sums shall be expended by the associations and organizations for the routine maintenance of their respective Confederate cemeteries and graves and for the graves of Confederate soldiers and sailors not otherwise cared for in other cemeteries, and in erecting and caring for markers, memorials, and monuments to the memory of such soldiers and sailors. All such associations and organizations, through their proper officers, are required after July 1 of each year to submit to the Director a certified statement that the funds appropriated to the association or organization in the preceding fiscal year were or will be expended for the routine maintenance of cemeteries specified in this section and the graves of Confederate soldiers and sailors and in erecting and caring for markers, memorials and monuments to the memory of such soldiers and sailors. An association or organization failing to comply with any of the requirements of this section shall be prohibited from receiving moneys allocated under this section for all subsequent fiscal years until the association or organization fully complies with the requirements.

B. Allocation of appropriations made pursuant to this section shall be based on the number of graves, monuments and markers as set forth opposite the association's or organization's name, or as documented by each association or organization multiplied by the rate of \$5 or the average actual cost of routine maintenance, whichever is greater, for each grave, monument or marker in the care of a Confederate memorial association or chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. For the purposes of this section the "average actual cost of care" shall be determined by the Department in a biennial survey of at least four properly maintained cemeteries, each located in a different geographical region of the Commonwealth.

For Frequently Asked Questions about Cemetery Preservation, please see http://www.dhr.virginia.gov/homepage_general/faq_cem_%20presv.htm

Federal Regulations, Guidelines and Policies.

Protection of Historic Properties (36CFR Part 800)

<http://www.achp.gov/regs.html>

Section 800.12 Emergency situations .

(a) Agency procedures. The agency official, in consultation with the appropriate SHPOs/THPOs, affected Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, and the Council, is encouraged to develop procedures for taking historic properties into account during operations which respond to a disaster or emergency declared by the President, a tribal government, or the Governor of a State or which respond to other immediate threats to life or property. If approved by the Council, the procedures shall govern the agency's historic preservation responsibilities during any disaster or emergency in lieu of Sec. Sec. 800.3 through 800.6.

(b) Alternatives to agency procedures. In the event an agency official proposes an emergency undertaking as an essential and immediate response to a disaster or emergency declared by the President, a tribal government, or the Governor of a State or another immediate threat to life or property, and the agency has not developed procedures pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, the agency official may comply with section 106 by:

(1) Following a programmatic agreement developed pursuant to Sec. 800.14(b) that contains specific provisions for dealing with historic properties in emergency situations; or

(2) Notifying the Council, the appropriate SHPO/THPO and any Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization that may attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties likely to be affected prior to the undertaking and affording them an opportunity to comment within seven days of notification. If the agency official determines that circumstances do not permit seven days for comment, the agency official shall notify the Council, the SHPO/THPO and the Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and invite any comments within the time available.

(c) Local governments responsible for section 106 compliance. When a local government official serves as the agency official for section 106 compliance, paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section also apply to an imminent threat to public health or safety as a result of a natural disaster or emergency declared by a local government's chief executive officer or legislative body, provided that if the Council or SHPO/THPO objects to the proposed action within seven days, the agency official shall comply with Sec. Sec. 800.3 through 800.6.

(d) Applicability. This section applies only to undertakings that will be implemented within 30 days after the disaster or emergency has been formally declared by the

appropriate authority. An agency may request an extension of the period of applicability from the Council prior to the expiration of the 30 days. Immediate rescue and salvage operations conducted to preserve life or property are exempt from the provisions of section 106 and this part.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_0.htm

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended)
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/FHPL/HistPrsvt.pdf>

Section 106

The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under Title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.

The Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48 FR 44716) http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/Prof_Qual_83.htm

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/index.htm>

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (36 CFR 67) <http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/tax/rehabstandards.htm>

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes

Department of Transportation Act

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND SECTION 4(F), AS AMENDED

This Act became law on October 15, 1966 (Public Law 89-670), 49 U.S.C. 303 (formerly 49 U.S.C. 1651(b)(2) and 49 U.S.C. 1653f). Public Law 90-495 (August 23, 1968) amended section 4(f) to its most commonly known form which is presented here. Public Law 97-449 (January 12, 1983) re-codified the Act from 49 U.S.C. 1651 to 49 U.S.C. 303. Congress has amended this Act three other times. The description of the Act, as amended, tracks the language of the United States Code except that (following common

usage) we refer to the “Act” (meaning the Act as amended) rather than to the “subchapter” or the “title” of the Code. 49 U.S.C. 303, Policy on lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.

Section 4(f)

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.

49 U.S.C. 303(b) The Secretary of Transportation shall cooperate and consult with the Secretaries of the Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and Agriculture, and with the States, in developing transportation plans and programs that include measures to maintain or enhance the natural beauty of lands crossed by transportation activities or facilities.

49 U.S.C. 303(c) The Secretary may approve a transportation program or project (other than any project for a park road or parkway under section 204 of title 23) [of the United States Code, “Federal Lands Highways Program”] requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, State, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge, or site) only if— (1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and (2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

PORTIONS, AS AMENDED

This Act became law on January 1, 1970 (Public Law 91-190), 42 U.S.C. 4321 and 4331-4335 and has been amended once. The description of the Act, as amended, tracks the language of the United States Code except that (following common usage) we refer to the “Act” (meaning the Act, as amended) rather than to the “subchapter” or the “title” of the Code. [42 U.S.C. 4321, Congressional declaration of purpose]

Section 2

The purposes of this Act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality. [42 U.S.C. 4331, Congressional declaration of national environmental policy]

Section 101

(a) The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man’s activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource exploitation,

and new and expanding technological advances and recognizing further the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of man, declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

(b) In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may—

(1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

(2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and esthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;

(3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; Preservation of historic, cultural, and natural heritage

(4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice;

(5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and

(6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.

(c) The Congress recognizes that each person should enjoy a healthful environment and that each person has a responsibility to contribute to the preservation of the environment. [42 U.S.C. 4332, Cooperation of agencies, reports, availability of information, recommendations, international and national coordination of efforts]

Section 102

The Congress authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible:

(1) the policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies set forth in this Act, and

(2) all agencies of the Federal government shall—

(A) utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment;

(B) identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by Section 202 of this Act [42 U.S.C. 4341-4347], which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration

in decision making along with economic and technical considerations; Environmental impact statements, etc.

(C) include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Consultation with agencies having special expertise prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by section 552 of title 5 [of the United States Code], and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes; (Remainder of section 102(D) omitted)

(E) study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources;

(F) recognize the worldwide and long-range character of environmental problems and, where consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, lend appropriate support to initiatives, resolutions, and programs designed to maximize international cooperation in anticipating and preventing a decline in the quality of mankind's world environment;

(G) makes available to States, counties, municipalities, institutions, and individuals, advice and information useful in restoring, maintaining, and enhancing the quality of the environment;

(H) initiate and utilize ecological information in the planning and development of resource-oriented projects;

(Remainder of paragraph omitted)

Section 103

(42 U.S.C. 4333, Conformity of administrative procedures to national environmental policy, omitted)

Section 104

(42 U.S.C. 4334, Other statutory obligations of agencies, omitted) 42 U.S.C. 4335, Efforts supplemental to existing authorizations

Section 105

The policies and goals set forth in this Act are supplementary to those set forth in existing authorizations of Federal agencies.

(Remainder of Act omitted)

Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

AS AMENDED http://www.cr.npd.gov/local-law/FHPL_NAGPRA.pdf

36 CFR Title 36 Part 60--NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

<http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/regulations.htm>

National Trust for Historic Preservation Guidelines. In any attempt to reconcile these divergent claims and motives for preservation and restoration there must be an informed and experienced guide. The following make up a brief guide:

1. The restoration of old and historic buildings requires the professional knowledge and special skill of trained and competent architects, historians, archaeologists, landscape architects, museumologists and experienced craftsmen.
2. No final decision as to a course of restorative action should be taken until (a) reasonable efforts have been made to exhaust the archaeological and documentary evidence as to the form and gradual changes of the monument, and (b) efforts that have been made to secure the record of such evidence, by drawings, photographs, notes and transcripts should be kept, and originals or copies made available to students in appropriate central libraries and where possible, published. In no case should evidence offered by the structure itself be destroyed or covered up until it has been fully recorded. Sample specimens of physical evidence should also be preserved. All changes proposed should be studied in drawing and specification form to ensure thorough communication between laymen, architect and craftsmen.
3. In the treatment of surviving old buildings it is generally better to preserve than repair, better to repair than to restore, better to restore than to reconstruct. It is also advisable, before initiating a project, to consider carefully the possibility that once begun it may lead to "creeping reconstruction." There is the possibility that repair may lead to restoration and thence to reconstruction. Reconstruction is frequently acceptable and advisable if the entire structure is not available; it is deplorable when a structure survives in its entirety.

4. It is ordinarily better to retain genuine old work of several periods rather than to arbitrarily "restore" the whole, by new work, to its aspect at a single period. This applies to work of periods later than those now admired, provided it represents a genuine creative effort, or is a part of the life's history of the building. In no case should our own artistic preferences or prejudices lead us to modify, on aesthetic grounds, work of a past period representing other tastes.

Truth is not only stranger than fiction; it is more varied and more interesting. However, it should be recognized that it is sometimes essential to remove later work in order to obtain evidence of the structure pertaining to an earlier and more important period. No surviving old work should be removed or rebuilt for structural reasons if any reasonable additional trouble and expense would suffice to preserve it.

5. Every reasonable additional care and expense is justified to approximate in new work, the materials, methods and quality of old construction. But new work should be permanently identified and great discretion should be used in simulating old materials with modern materials. If old materials from other buildings are used in a restoration, their source and use should be permanently recorded. The use in an appropriate manner of old materials and details of the period and character is commendable when those materials are otherwise doomed to loss or destruction and their use is thereby an act of preservation. In securing materials for restoration work there should be no demolition or removal of buildings where there is a reasonable prospect that they will remain intact or as historic ruins on their own site. Where missing features are to be replaced without sufficient evidence as to their own original form, careful study should be made of other surviving examples of the period and region and precedents found for the replacement.

6. The nature of preservation and restoration work is such that it generally involves more time than would be expected in new construction. Many of the most important problems are unsuspected until the fabric is opened up.

7. When for educational or preservation purposes it is deemed necessary for a building to be removed to another site, its restoration should be guided by sound restoration principles as outlined above.

8. Complete reconstruction for educational purposes should also follow the above principles, with the caveat that any but a reconstruction based on the most substantial of evidence is a sham.

9. When an historic building survives into modern times, fortunately in its original use, it is important to retain all its principle features with only minor modification for modern use. When an historic building ceases to be used for its original purpose other uses should be sought to perpetuate its life.

Only modern uses should be adopted which are consistent with the preservation of the building's outstanding values. In such cases, limited compromise with restoration

standards may be justified, especially in the interior, in order to obtain such conveniences as are necessary to modern life.

Since our needs and capabilities are always expanding, important or interesting features that cannot be restored at the moment should be covered over and protected to await future treatment.

Only a limited number of historical buildings, and even exceptional buildings, are important enough to be preserved solely for exhibition. These buildings must be cared for and restored with the utmost fidelity to the highest professional restoration standards.

The above guidelines are not intended to be dogmatic and inflexible, but rather to provide the Authority a firm foundation for its own work. They are broad enough that other points of view can be accommodated, but they are specific enough that the difference is clear between good and bad preservation.

I see these guidelines as forming the underpinnings of one of the best and most admirable programs in the nation, and certainly in the metropolitan area. As the parklands themselves preserve and protect natural resources, so historic preservation protects manmade resources. By means of historic preservation, we can better maintain the cultural ecology of our community and help to create an environment that is a joy to live in. As this environment grows and changes its cultural ecology must be balanced. The evidences of our past must be preserved to explain and enrich both the past and the present.

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

ACTION -

Contract Award – Open End Contracts for Archaeological Services

ISSUE:

Approval of open end contract awards to Louis Berger Group of Washington, D.C., URS of Gaithersburg, Maryland, and Wetlands Studies and Solutions of Gainesville, Virginia, in the total amount of \$250,000, to provide for Archaeological Services at various sites in the County.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Park Authority Director recommends that the Park Authority Board approve contract awards to the firms of Louis Berger Group, URS, and Wetlands Studies and Solutions. The total contract award is in an amount not to exceed \$250,000, for a period of one year with the option of two (2) two-year renewals.

TIMING:

Board action is requested on April 12, 2006 to maintain project schedules.

BACKGROUND:

In January 2006, staff began the process to establish an open end contract for consultant services to provide Archaeological Services. At least five parks owned by the Park Authority, including Sully Historic Site (barns and second slave quarter), Fairfax Villa, Fort Willard, Mount Gilead, and Laurel Hill, as well as other park master plans, have been identified as needing archaeological studies in the near future. Staff has completed the steps necessary to select the consulting firms. The process included establishment of a Selection Advisory Committee comprised of three staff members from the Resource Management Division to review the qualification material submitted by interested firms and perform interviews. Six firms were interviewed for the contract. The criteria used to select the firms included: general experience, experience with archaeological studies on historic and prehistoric archaeological sites, qualifications of staff, quality of work, project management and quality control strategies, response to prepared questions, and responsiveness.

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

The services to be provided from the consultants are:

Documentary Research - Research land use history, previous archaeological investigations, and environmental setting and consult historic maps and photographs to develop an historic context and provide a foundation to guide the decision making process regarding management, maintenance and interpretation of the site's features.

Surveying and Mapping - Provide a record of the site, including landforms, structures, vegetation, and other natural and cultural resources. Services may include use of surveying techniques, archaeological techniques, photography, ground penetrating radar systems, and GIS mapping systems.

Phase I Archaeological Survey—A testing program to determine the presence or absence of potentially significant archaeological resources in a project area. Methods may include shovel testing, surface collection, or use of remote sensing techniques.

Phase II Archaeological Testing – Systematic testing to determine site integrity, site boundaries, cultural affiliation and eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. A combination of shovel testing and the excavation of units may be used to examine the site. Findings would be evaluated with reference to a historic context.

Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery Excavation—Excavation of a significant site so that it can address research questions. Findings of such a study may be used in combination with other studies to provide site interpretation.

Analysis and Report Preparation – Analysis of artifacts and features recovered or documented from a site to interpret what occurred there. A report would be prepared documenting the findings.

Contracts will be signed with the above firms for a period of one (1) year with the option of two (2) two-year extensions. \$100 will be encumbered to open and establish each contract. As services are needed on a specific project, a proposal will be requested from one of the open-end firms based on: 1. expertise required for the project, 2. availability of the firm, and 3. intention to distribute the work.

Each contract will be terminated when the time frame expires or the maximum amount of the contract has been assigned to projects, whichever occurs first. These contracts do not guarantee any amount to any firm. If no work is contracted, no funds will be spent.

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funds are necessary in the amount of \$100 per consultant to open and establish the contracts for open end professional services for a total of \$300. Funds are available in the amount of \$300 in Project 004534, Park Contingency, Fund 371, Park Capital Improvement Fund to open these contracts. Funds will be charged to each project as work is assigned up to the maximum amount of the contract. This Board action does not commit funds if no work is contracted.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

None

STAFF:

Michael A. Kane, Director

Timothy K. White, Chief Operating Officer

Lynn Tadlock, Director, Planning and Development Division

Mike Baird, Management Analyst III, Financial Management Branch

Cindy Messinger, Director, Resource Management Division

Michael Rierson, Manager, Resource Stewardship Branch

Elizabeth Crowell, Manager, Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section

Richard Sacchi, Project Manager, Cultural Resource Management and Protection
Section

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

ACTION -

Contract Award – Open End Contracts for Cultural Landscape Report Consultant Services

ISSUE:

Approval of open ended contract awards to Rhodeside and Harwell, Inc., of Alexandria, Virginia, John Milner Associates of Charlottesville, Virginia, and Versar of Springfield, Virginia in the total amount of \$250,000 to provide Cultural Landscape Reports for various sites in the County.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Park Authority Director recommends that the Park Authority Board approve contract awards to the firms of Rhodeside and Harwell, Inc., John Milner Associates, and Versar. The total contract award is in an amount not to exceed \$250,000, for a period of one year with the option of two (2) two-year renewals.

TIMING:

Board action is requested on April 12, 2006 to maintain the project schedules.

BACKGROUND:

In January of 2006, staff began the process to establish an open end contract for consultant services to provide Cultural Landscape Reports. Cultural Landscape Studies have been identified for at least three historic sites owned by the Park Authority including Sully Historic Site (Treatment plan), Fort Willard (Treatment Plan), and Frying Pan Farm Park (Floris Community Regional Plan). Staff has completed the steps necessary to select the consulting firms. The process included establishment of a Selection Advisory Committee comprised of three staff members from two different divisions to review the qualification material submitted by interested firms and perform interviews. Four firms were interviewed for the contract. The criteria used to select the firms included: general experience, experience with Cultural Landscape Reports and historic sites, qualifications of staff, quality of work, project management and quality control strategies, response to prepared questions, and responsiveness.

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

The services to be provided from the consultants are:

Historical Research - Research the history of the landscape to determine its historic periods of significance and provide a foundation to guide the decision making process regarding management, maintenance and interpretation of the site's features.

Surveying and Mapping - Provide a record of the landscape as it presently exists, including landforms, structures, vegetation, and other natural and cultural resources. Services may include use of surveying techniques, archaeological techniques, photography, Ground Penetrating Radar systems, and GIS mapping systems.

Site Analysis – Determine the landscape features that contribute to the landscape's historic character. This may include off-site items such as view shed and surrounding land uses.

Landscape Architectural Services - Provide design services for various purposes including adaptation of historic sites to public use, implementation of preservation and management plans, and interpretation of the historic and culturally significant aspects of the landscape.

Archaeological Services - Provide minor archaeological services to cover unforeseen circumstances relating to the cultural resources under study.

Contracts will be signed with the above firms for a period of one (1) year with the option of two (2) one-year extensions. \$100 will be encumbered to open and establish each contract. As services are needed on a specific project, a proposal will be requested from one of the open end firms based on: 1. expertise required for the project, 2. availability of the firm, and 3. intention to distribute the work.

Each contract will be terminated when the time frame expires or the maximum amount of the contract has been assigned to projects, whichever occurs first. These contracts do not guarantee any amount to any firm. If no work is contracted, no funds will be expended.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funds are necessary in the amount of \$100 per consultant to open and establish the contracts for open-end professional services for a total of \$300. Funds are available in the amount of \$300 in Project 004534, Park Contingency, Fund 371, Park Capital Improvement Fund to open these contracts. Funds will be charged to each project as work is assigned up to the maximum amount of the contract. This Board action does not commit funds if no work is contracted.

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

None

STAFF:

Michael A. Kane, Director

Timothy K. White, Chief Operating Officer

Lynn Tadlock, Director, Planning and Development Division

Michael Baird, Management Analyst III, Financial Planning Branch

Cindy Messinger, Director, Resource Management Division

Michael Rierson, Manager, Resource Stewardship Branch

Elizabeth Crowell, Manager, Cultural Resource Management and Protection Section

Richard Sacchi, Project Manager, Cultural Resource Management and Protection
Section

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

ACTION –

Approval- Installation of a Plaque at Mt. Zephyr Park (Mt Vernon District)

ISSUE:

Approval for installation of a plaque at Mt. Zephyr Park by the Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association, Incorporated in recognition of the contributions for the betterment and preservation of the park by Ingeborg Catlett.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Park Authority Director recommends approval of a request by the Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association, Incorporated to install a plaque at Mt. Zephyr Park in recognition of Ingeborg Catlett's contributions for the betterment and preservation of the park in accordance with Policy 406 Signs and Displays.

TIMING:

Board action is requested on April 12, 2006 to permit the installation of a plaque and provide assistance in conducting a community ceremony this spring.

BACKGROUND:

On September 21, 2005 the Mt. Zephyr Citizen's Association adopted a resolution recognizing Ms. Ingeborg Catlett for her contributions in the development of Mt. Zephyr Park, for her contributions to the protection of natural, cultural and horticultural resources of the Fairfax County park system, for the advancement of Mt. Zephyr Park as a neighborhood recreational facility, and to her overall service to the community for the past 40 years. As a part of that resolution it was requested that "Mt. Zephyr Park be renamed to the "Ingeborg Catlett Park" or in the alternative erect a stone and plaque in her honor".

On November 30, 2005, Mr. Gil McCutcheon received a letter of request amending their original resolution to have the park dedicated to Mrs. Catlett for her contributions and service to the community by placing a dedication plaque at the park. Along with that request was an endorsement letter from Mt. Vernon Supervisor, Gerry Hyland.
(Attachment 2)

Board Agenda Item
April 12, 2006

The proposed plaque is consistent with Park Authority policy which permits permanent signs that recognize individuals or organizations and is similar to what has been done in the past. Mr. McCutcheon is in support of this request.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

ENCLOSED DOCUMENTS:

Attachment 1: Policy 406 Signs and Displays

Attachment 2: November 30, 2005, letter of request from Dan Fisher-Burrier,
President, Mt. Zephyr Association, Incorporated and related
attachments

STAFF:

Michael A. Kane, Director

Timothy K. White, Chief Operating Officer

Cindy Messinger, Director, Resource Management Division

Todd Johnson, Director, Park Operations Division

Dan Sutherland, Manager, Grounds Maintenance Branch

Joe Nilson, Manager, Area 3 Management

Policy 406 Signs and Displays

The Authority shall protect the esthetic qualities of the parklands and facilities under its control or ownership by requiring that a permit be obtained from the Authority prior to the placement of any sign or display on park property by any group, individual or government agency.

Temporary signs, banners or flags (including religious displays or articles associated with a religious service, celebration, or activity) introduced by an entity other than the Park Authority to promote an event held in a Fairfax County park shall be in accordance with the permit granted by the Authority and the time period specified in the permit, and shall be removed by the entity within 48 hours after the event is terminated.

In keeping with the protection of the esthetic qualities of parklands and facilities, advertisements shall be limited to those in written agreements with the Park Authority Board.

Signage for joint ventures and privatized development on parkland shall require the approval of the Park Authority Board.

Permanent signs recognizing individuals or organizations shall be consistent with existing Park Authority sign materials and design, and when possible, shall be incorporated into existing sign structures.

Only one permanent sign recognizing an individual or an organization may be placed in a park. Signage recognizing Adopt-A-Field and Adopt-A-Park participants shall be consistent with the guidelines of these programs.

Revised and adopted October 28, 1998

***Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association, Incorporated
P.O. Box 322
Mt. Vernon, Virginia 22121***

November 30, 2005

Fairfax County Park Authority Board
12055 Government Center Parkway
Suite 927
Fairfax County, Virginia 22035-1118

Attention: Mr. Gil McCutcheon, Director

Subject: Ingeborg Catlett

Dear Mr. McCutcheon:

Concurrent to our conversations regarding Ingeborg Catlett, please find attached the request we discussed. The request includes the Resolution by the Association and a letter of endorsement from Supervisor Hyland.

We have kept the request content to a minimum in the economy of time, however, the content is indicative of Mrs. Catlett's contribution to the Mt. Zephyr Park since its inception.

Since it's inception Mrs. Catlett has aggressively pursued the protection of the park and personally endeavored to protect the natural resources of the Park and garnered community support to keep the stream (Little Dogue Creek) and unimproved areas clean of debris and refuse thereby preserving the natural horticultural aspects of the wooded area. She has spearheaded community involvement in the Park and is responsible, in large part, of prohibiting invasion of the wooded areas from a number of outside influences including those seeking to take up residence in the wooded areas with tents and campsites.

Her endeavors contributed, beyond the normal call to duty, to the betterment and preservation of Mt. Zephyr Park and orchestrated it's advancement to a treasured neighborhood facility enjoyed by all.

We appreciate your efforts on behalf of Mrs. Catlett and look forward to the approval of this request.

Sincerely yours,



D. Molyneaux Fisher-Burrier

Reply to: 8601 Washington Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22309
703-780-5593

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Mount Zephyr Citizen's Association (MZCA) recognizes the contributions of Ingeborg Catlett in the development of Mt. Zephyr Park, and

WHEREAS, the citizens of Mt Zephyr recognize that Ingeborg Catlett has made a significant contribution to the protection of natural, cultural, and horticultural resources of the Fairfax County park system through the development of Mt. Zephyr Park, and

WHEREAS, Ingeborg Catlett has substantially contributed to the advancement of Mt. Zephyr Park as a neighborhood recreational facility, and

WHEREAS, Ingeborg Catlett has made significant contributions to the betterment of a specific park, consistent with the established criteria and standards within its designated park classification, and

WHEREAS, in recognition of her efforts for the betterment of Mt. Zephyr and its environs which has significantly improved the quality of life and recreational resources available to the citizens of Mt. Zephyr and its environs, and for 40 years of service to the community,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, that by, through and on behalf of the citizens of the Mt. Zephyr Community and it's environs, proceed through appropriate channels to rename Mt. Zephyr Park the "Ingeborg Catlett Park" or in the alternative, erect a stone and plaque in her honor in recognition of her contributions and further, that the Mt. Vernon District Supervisor, Gerald Hyland, bring this resolution before the County Board of Supervisors for approval.

Resolved this 21st day of September, 2005 by unanimous vote of the Association

President

Dillon Lee

REQUEST

TO: Fairfax County Park Authority Board

RE: Mrs. Ingeborg Catlett

SUBJECT: Park Dedication

Item

A request to dedicate Mt. Zephyr Park, located in the Mt. Zephyr Subdivision of Fairfax County, Virginia, to Mrs. Ingeborg Catlett upon her retirement from the Board of Directors after 40 years of service to the community.

Background and Importance

Mt. Zephyr is an historic community situated on the original Mt. Zephyr Farm, a segment of George Washington's Muddy Hole Farm. The site has a well-documented presence in the annals of history from its beginnings in the 1700's to the present. Mt Zephyr's landowners were responsible for important local developments such as building roadways including the first stretch of Richmond Highway in 1857. According to early maps, the location of the present day Mt. Zephyr Park was heavily wooded and was surrounded by pasture and crop-producing fields. An especially detailed map made in 1859 by local landowner and surveyor, Warrington Gillingham, shows that the stream running through the park, Little Dogue Creek, was used by the occupants of the nearby Mt. Zephyr house and barn. The stream was also one of the mill chases fueling Washington's Grist Mill.

Mt. Zephyr subdivision is a 65 year-old community built on the original site of the farm. Early on, residents of Mt. Zephyr recognized the importance of its history and put forth efforts to maintain the integrity of the area. As the neighborhood grew and progressed, the need for a

community park gained importance. In the 1970's the Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association initiated efforts to convert the small parcel of county land next to Dogue Creek to a park. The initiative was led by Mrs. Ingeborg Catlett. The process involved countless hours of work and determination including reviewing and analyzing the 1980 Master Plan. Mrs. Catlett's efforts ultimately resulted in persuading the county to include the parcel in its Master Plan. In 1981, the proposal for the park was integrated and in 1982, a plan was initiated for Mt. Zephyr Park. Needless to say, the park was established.

As a result of budget restraints during the early years, the park received only quarterly maintenance by the Park Authority. Mrs. Catlett organized and lead efforts to maintain and clean the park in the interim by residents of the neighborhood. She also lobbied for improvements and in the late 1980's an asphalt walking path and bridge over the stream were built. The space began to take on the appearance of an established park and usage increased.

With the influx of new residents, particularly younger families with small children, the need for a safe haven playground arose. Mrs. Catlett began the processes necessary to acquire funding for a playground. Her lobbying efforts resulted in acquiring funding in 1998 and, one year later, that effort came to fruition and the playground was built. The dramatic improvements caused the Park Authority to take a renewed interest in the park and, with Mrs. Catlett's prompting, provided picnic tables and benches. Today the park is a favorite recreation spot for both children and adults. The park is a focal point the Mt. Zephyr community and is protected by neighborhood watch initiatives and surrounding neighbors.

Why Honor Mrs. Catlett?

The question rises, why do the residents of Mt. Zephyr wish to honor Mrs. Catlett? Beginning in the 1950's a small civic association was established. At that time, Mt. Zephyr was a sleepy little community with dirt roads, poor storm water drainage and other infrastructure problems. When the Catletts moved to Mt. Zephyr in the 1960's, not much had changed or improved. Mrs. Catlett initiated a dynamic new association to tackle these problems. Under her 42 years of leadership and efforts the association has grown and the neighborhood has flourished. Mrs. Catlett has been the primary catalyst in keeping the association and neighborhood together

for the last 40-plus years. She has been a steady presence, serving as a board member since the association's inception and as president for a total of 12 years. Mrs. Catlett was instrumental in getting the 1970's bond referendum through for community improvement in Mt. Zephyr which resulted in completion of Phase I and Phase II of the Community Improvement (2000). Her community service has also extended far beyond the confines of Mt. Zephyr. There have been many projects completed under her leadership. Her tireless devotion includes county-wide programs, MVCCA, and others too numerous to cover here. For the residents of Mt. Zephyr, Mrs. Catlett will always be revered for her work in converting a neglected patch of land into a beautiful and treasured community center. The Mt. Zephyr Park is perhaps the crowning achievement and a symbol of Mrs. Catlett's dedication to her community. The park has improved the quality of life in Mt. Zephyr considerably. It provides a sense of cohesiveness and pride and is enjoyed and loved by all the residents---not only as a place for families and children to play---the park has also inspired a couple of marriage proposals. It provides a respite for many of our elderly residents to simply sit and enjoy. In other words, the park is a success. After 40 years of unselfish devotion to Mt. Zephyr and its causes, Mrs. Catlett is retiring from the board at age 80. It is indeed fitting that the Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association pay tribute to her contributions, not only for today, but for future generations who will also visit and enjoy the Mt. Zephyr Park.

A Resolution Passed

At a September 2005 Special meeting, the association unanimously voted and resolved to honor Mrs. Catlett for her 40-plus years of service to Mt. Zephyr and the Mount Vernon District. A broadly written resolution was passed with various options. In the time between that resolution and present, the Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association became incorporated and has assumed new initiatives and direction. Efforts include working with the Mt. Vernon Estate Historians and Librarians to reveal the significant and important history of Mt. Zephyr. The association strives to maintain the integrity of the area from an historical perspective. The Mt. Zephyr Park comprises land that was originally part of the Mt. Zephyr Farm from Woodley Drive to Old Mill Road. In light of the historic significance of the land on which the Park resides,

leaving the name of the park as "Mt. Zephyr Park" would be in the best interest of the County and Park Authority. Therefore, we wish to amend our resolution to either of the two following options:

1. Our first desire would be to have the present park dedicated to Mrs. Catlett as "Mount Zephyr Park, dedicated to Ingeborg Catlett in recognition of her contributions to Mt. Zephyr and its environs." This would accomplish the wishes of the community without a change of name.

2. Secondly, allow the community to erect a stone and plaque dedicated to Mrs. Catlett with the following phrase. "Dedicated to Ingeborg Catlett in recognition of her contributions to Mt. Zephyr and the Mt. Zephyr Park." The association wishes to dedicate the entire park to Mrs. Catlett to assure perpetuity (versus sections or features such as the playground). While the playground may disappear or change in time, the parkland itself will not.

The Mt. Zephyr Park is a neighborhood park---it is our little place within our little community---and although occasionally enjoyed by others from neighboring subdivisions, it is primarily utilized by Mt. Zephyr residents who feel blessed and thankful for it. We hope the Board will approve our request and allow us to honor the park by honoring Mrs. Catlett. We do not foresee any financial burden accompanying this request on the Park Authority. The Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association is prepared to fund reasonable costs related to changes in signage on the Park Masthead. Costs for erecting a stone and plaque would be borne by the association.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. If there are any questions or desire for further information please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

November 15, 2005

D. Molyneaux Fisher-Burrier
e-mail: vapoet1@cox.net
(703) 780-5593

Mt. Zephyr Citizens Association
PO Box 322
Mt. Vernon, VA 22121



Mount Vernon



Gerald W. "Gerry" Hyland
Board of Supervisors, Mt. Vernon District
2511 Parkers Lane
Alexandria, VA 22306

Telephone (703) 780-7518

Fax: (703) 780-1491

November 30, 2005

Mr. Gil McCutcheon
Fairfax County Park Authority Board of Directors
7710 Marine Drive
Alexandria, Virginia 22307

Dear Gil:

It is a great pleasure to support the request by the Mt. Zephyr Citizen's Association to honor Mrs. Ingeborg Catlett by dedicating Mt. Zephyr Park in her name.

I have known Mrs. Catlett for 18 years and she has a long legacy of community activism. In the 1960s, she helped found the Mt. Zephyr Citizen's Association and under her leadership it has grown into an influential group. Specifically, she was a tireless advocate for the establishment of Mt. Zephyr Park, which has truly enhanced the quality of life for the residents of that neighborhood and it will be enjoyed by future generations for years to come.

I can think of no more fitting way to acknowledge Mrs. Catlett's contributions by dedicating Mt. Zephyr Park in her honor.

Sincerely,

Gerry Hyland
Mount Vernon District Supervisor

Cc: Dan Fisher-Burrier